DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 054 526 EA 003 641

AUTHOR Eddinger, Lucille

TITLE Federal Aid: New Directions for Education in 1970-71. An Education U.S.A. Special Report.

INSTITUTION National School Public Relations Association, Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE 70

NOTE 51p.

AVAILABLE FROM National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. (Stock #411-12776, $4.00, quantity discounts)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Economics; *Educational Finance; Exceptional Child Education; *Federal Aid; *Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Financial Needs; Financial Problems; Financial Services; Handicapped Students; Higher Education; Lunch Programs; Nutrition; Student Loan Programs; Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

This document presents an overview of the status of Federal legislation for and appropriations to education for the fiscal year 1971. Federal assistance to higher education is discussed, and the amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), the National School Lunch Act, and the Special Milk Program are explained. Tables list current programs administered by the United States Office of Education. (RA)

ED054526

EDUCATION U.S.A.

SPECIAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FEDERAL AID: New Directions for Education in 1970-71

A Publication of
National School Public Relations Association

EA 003 641

PROCESS WITH MICROFICHE
AND PUBLISHER'S PRICES.
MICROFICHE REPRODUCTION
ONLY.

This Is an Education U.S.A. Special Report

Education U.S.A., a weekly newsletter founded in 1958, has introduced new dimensions to educational journalism in the United States. In addition to the newsletter, which reports major developments in preschool to graduate level education, the editors of *Education U.S.A.* prepare special in-depth reports on current education issues and problems.

News and interpretive features for the newsletter, based on materials from hundreds of sources, are written by the editors of *Education U.S.A.* and by correspondents in the 50 states. The aim: to keep the busy American educator informed of the important developments in his profession. The *Washington Monitor* section of *Education U.S.A.* is a current report on activities at the U.S. Office of Education, Capitol Hill, and other federal agencies that make significant decisions in education. Each year the editors also prepare *The Shape of Education*, a special handbook of articles on trend-making subjects in American education.

The special reports are prepared when the editors decide that a new development in education is important enough to be covered in detail. *Federal Aid: New Directions for Education in 1970-71* is the 21st report in this series.

Education U.S.A. publications are published by the National School Public Relations Association. The weekly newsletter *Education U.S.A.* is published in cooperation with the American Association of School Administrators, the American Association of School Librarians, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, and the National Association of Secondary School Principals. It is published weekly, September through May, and twice in the summertime. Subscriptions are $21 a year. Address orders to the National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

This Special Report, *Federal Aid: New Directions for Education in 1970-71*, was produced by the staff of *Education U.S.A.* It was written by Lucille Eddinger. The editors are indebted to staff members at the U.S. Office of Education for assistance in the preparation of this report.

Additional copies of *Federal Aid: New Directions for Education in 1970-71* may be ordered from the National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. All orders must be accompanied by payment unless submitted on an authorized purchase order. Prices: single copy, $4; 2 to 9 copies, $3.60 each; 10 or more copies, $3.20 each. Stock #411-12776.

COPYRIGHT 1970 NATIONAL SCHOOL PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted work has been granted to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and to the organization operating under contract with the Office of Education to reproduce documents included in the ERIC system by means of microfiche only, but this right is not conferred to any users of the microfiche received from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service. Further reproduction of any part requires permission of the copyright owner.

ED054526

FEDERAL AID: New Directions for Education in 1970-71

OVERVIEW: THE FEDERAL INVOLVEMENT EXPANDS

The landscape of education has changed significantly since 1965 when the federal government took on its first large-scale commitment to aid the nation's schools with the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Then the challenge was to overcome the traditional fear that federal aid meant federal control. Five years later, with the passage of the 1970 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the principle of federal aid is not only accepted, but there is considerable sentiment that the federal government is not doing enough and should assume a bigger share of the cost of education.

The 1970 education legislation goes a long step in that direction. The amendments to ESEA include not only a continued large-scale federal commitment to elementary and secondary education with emphasis on aid to the disadvantaged, but also they consolidate and expand existing legislation for aid to the handicapped, vocational education, and adult education. The 1970 amendments to the National School Lunch Act and the School Nutrition Act of 1966 represent a major step to expand and improve this program. All needy children will be offered free or reduced-price lunches, with top priority going to the most needy. The 1970 extension of the Special Milk Program represents a further assumption of federal responsibility in this area.

Even though the 1970 legislation authorizes an increased commitment of federal aid to education, it must be viewed against the backdrop of the Administration's attempt to bank the fires of inflation and hold down spending. While Congress authorized an unprecedented $24.8 billion funding level for the three-year extension of the ESEA bill, President Nixon vetoed the $4.4 billion education appropriations bill for fiscal 1971.

The authorization-appropriations process played out each fiscal year often seems like an elaborate game of chess with the Administration and Congress facing each other across the board, the stakes in the billions of dollars.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview: The Federal Involvement Expands 1
Appropriations Set for 1970-71 4
Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments 11
Amendments to the National School Lunch Act 24
Special School Milk Program 29
Higher Education 32
Appropriations Summary, USOE 37
Appropriations, Selected Educational Activities 38
Guide to Federal Money for Education 40

In this annual test of wills, each side makes points as it succeeds in checkmating the other. President Nixon won the first round in the fiscal 1971 contest when he vetoed the education budget. But Congress one-upped him with its vote to override his veto.

A close student of the game will notice, however, that the issues are never as simple and clear-cut as the players claim. The President said he vetoed the 1971 education appropriations bill because "I flatly refuse to go along with the kind of big spending that is wrong for all the American people." But another part of his statement throws some light on the real issue. He notes that he called for "wide-ranging reforms" in his March 1970 education message. Congress apparently did not get the message. According to President Nixon, the appropriations bill "raises the spending on old approaches that experience has proved inadequate, rather than moving boldly on the new approaches that we need." In the President's view, Congress compounded the problem by cutting the funds he requested for such "forward-looking programs" as dropout prevention, educational opportunity, and research.

House Democratic leader Carl Albert of Oklahoma put his finger on the real problem when he said before the vote to override the President's veto: "The issue is not inflation--the issue is whether the President is to dictate national priorities as between expenditures down to the last decimal point, and deny to the Congress its constitutional duty of setting national policy through legislation."

Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Labor-HEW appropriations subcommittee, agreed with the President that some education programs may be outmoded and ineffective. But, he added: "The proper method of change--for any President and for any Congress--is the lawful process of modification or repeal by legislation through the legislative committees, not fiscal strangulation."

When it comes to national priorities in the education appropriations bill, Magnuson asserted that Congress is better informed because it listened to scores of witnesses during hearings on the legislation. "The Bureau of the Budget and the White House were not exposed to those same dedicated people and those well thought-out views," Magnuson said. Though there can be "honest difference" on the issue of priorities, he maintained, "if one is in touch with the people, education of our young people is of the highest priority."

The Gap—Authorizations Versus Appropriations

But to state and local education officials sitting on the sidelines wondering how much federal money they will get once the game is over, one of the most puzzling aspects is the vast difference between the amount in the authorizing legislation and the amount actually appropriated.

A dramatic illustration of the authorization-appropriations gap is contained in the 1970-71 education legislation. The amendments to ESEA authorize an expenditure level of $7.1 billion for fiscal 1971. In contrast, the $4.4 billion education appropriations bill approved by Congress over the President's veto contains only $1.8 billion for elementary and secondary programs.

A simple way to understand the difference between authorizations and appropriations is to read authorizations as "promises" and appropriations as "cash-on-the-line." The reasons for the gap between the promises and cash-on-the-line are both political and technical.

On the political side, large dollar authorizations were established by the Johnson Administration and approved by Congress in 1964 and 1965 when a series of "Great Society" programs were initiated to combat poverty and disease and to raise the nation's educational standards, principally through ESEA. These decisions came on the heels of the 1964 tax cut. The nation's growing commitment in Vietnam, together with its escalating costs, intensified the problem. The cutback in appropriations began with President Johnson's last education budget for fiscal 1969, which was considered austere. The final $3.6 billion appropriated by Congress represented a $122.3 million cut in the President's request.

On the technical side, the gap between authorizations and appropriations is the result of checks and balances built into the legislative machinery. A Congressional authorization sets a spending ceiling on programs. It is not a commitment--it doesn't mean all the money has to be spent. The Congressional committees working on authorizing legislation such as the ESEA bill hold hearings, evaluate the evidence, and determine the top amount of money that may be spent on that particular program. It is then up to the appropriations committee to determine how much the federal government can afford to spend on that particular program for the upcoming fiscal year.

A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations reveals that federal aid appropriations fell from 80% of authorizations in 1966 to 65% in 1970. The widest gap occurred in programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the study shows.

1970-71 Legislation

The new amendments to the ESEA bill, with a $24 billion authorization for a three-year period, represent the largest education authorization in history. President Nixon noted when he signed the bill that he was doing so with "considerable reluctance," because it authorizes spending which he termed "both excessive and misdirected." This comes back again to the test of wills between the President and Congress--who shall set national priorities.

APPROPRIATIONS SET FOR 1970-71

On Aug. 18, 1970, two weeks before many of the nation's schools reopened, the Senate seconded House action overriding President Nixon's veto of the fiscal 1971 education appropriation bill. It gave the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) $4.4 billion to administer a burgeoning crop of federal programs covering every aspect of education from kindergarten to graduate school. The money represented a $453 million increase over the $3.9 billion President Nixon had requested for education and $606 million more than the fiscal 1970 education budget.

Sen. Norris Cotton of New Hampshire, ranking Republican sponsor of the appropriation bill, who voted with the majority to override the veto, challenged the President's argument that the bill was inflationary. He pointed out that when it went to conference, it was nearly $1 billion over the President's budget. "When it came out of conference, it was $453 million over the original budget, but it was nearly $375 million under the bill that passed the Senate," Cotton noted. Proclaiming himself "a Nixon Republican" who should be supporting the President because of his status on the committee, the New Hampshire Senator nonetheless declared that he would not vote to sustain the veto. He explained: "I felt this year that we had produced as good a bill as we could, and that if we had to do it over again we would not be able to do any better."

Senator Magnuson countered the President's inflation argument. "For the life of me, I cannot agree that investing money in raising the educational level of young people and adults in our nation is inflationary. Surely it has the opposite effect. No one would seriously suggest that kids in schools are inflationary."

Democrats hit hard at the President's thesis that the budget increase would add to inflation. Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield (D-Mont.) put it succinctly: "It is so easy to vote millions for ABM's and SST's and then to reject money for the ABC's." The argument took a similar turn in the House. Rep. Nick Galifianakis (D-N.C.) observed that the $4.4 billion education appropriation "is less than the cost overruns for some of our overgrown military projects." He said the $453 million increase the President objected to "is nearly $300 million less than the Administration planned to spend to bail out the Penn Central Railroad after it collapsed into bankruptcy."

House Speaker John W. McCormack (D-Mass.) contended that inflation was a "scarecrow" issue. He said Nixon would have signed the education bill had he been up for reelection. Only 16 Republicans, none of them up for reelection, sided with the President in the 77-16 Senate vote. The House vote was 289-114, well over the necessary two-thirds needed to override the veto.

Members of Congress were under heavy pressure from educators to overrule the President. If his veto had been sustained, it would have meant a replay of the agonizing fiscal 1970 situation when Nixon refused to sign the Labor-HEW bill, which was $1 billion over his budget, and Congress had to go through the process of producing a new measure. It wasn't until March 1970, nine months after fiscal 1970 had begun, that President Nixon signed a scaled-down version of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill which contained $3.8 billion for USOE--about $600 million more than he had requested.

Observers credited the education lobby with much of the behind-the-scenes maneuvering that led to the large vote to override. Formed in the spring of 1969, the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Federal Education Programs brought together a coalition of over 70 organizations representing diverse interests in education from libraries to school boards. With missionary zeal, Emergency Committee volunteers pursued their goal--to bring the appropriations for education in line with authorizations. Educators came en masse to Washington on a dutch-treat basis to do something many of them had never done before--lobby their congressman. When they succeeded in adding $1 billion to the first version of the fiscal 1970 appropriations bill, the chairman of the House appropriations committee, Rep. George H. Mahon (D-Texas) called the group "the second most powerful lobby in the country."

In an effort to avoid the haggling of fiscal 1970 and get faster action on the fiscal 1971 appropriations bill, the USOE budget for the first time was taken out of the regular Labor-HEW appropriations bill and considered separately. Rep. Daniel J. Flood (D-Pa.), chairman of the House Labor-HEW appropriations subcommittee, explained that this was done "so that school districts, state departments of education, colleges, and others who are involved in the nation's educational system will be able to make more orderly plans for the next school year."

Congress delivered the education appropriations bill for the President's signature by July 31, 1970. Not since 1959, when the fiscal 1960 appropriations bill was enacted by July 14, had Congress taken final action on an education measure so early. In recent years, the Labor-HEW bill has not cleared Congress until late fall or early spring. The fiscal 1971 measure was approved by large margins--357-30 in the House and 88-0 in the Senate.

In its final form (see chart, p. 37), the appropriations bill, which is $453 million more than the President wanted, boosts federal aid in most of the major categories: impacted areas at $551 million represents a $126 million increase over the President's proposed budget; elementary and secondary education at $1.8 billion, a $232 million increase; vocational education, $494 million, a $54 million increase; education for the handicapped, $105 million, a $10 million increase; higher education, $968 million, a $110 million increase; community education (libraries), $85 million, a $26 million increase.

The only substantial cuts in President Nixon's budget recommendations were made in research and training--chopped from $118 million to $90 million. His request for $150 million for emergency aid to help schools with desegregation problems was halved to $75 million. The conferees reportedly felt that the $150 million could not be spent effectively before the school year was well under way.

Desegregation Amendments

The bill contains the controversial Whitten amendments. Named after the original sponsor, Rep. Jamie L. Whitten (D-Miss.), the amendments forbid the use of federal funds to force busing in schools to obtain racial balance. Dropped in conference was another amendment introduced by Rep. Charles R. Jonas (R-N.C.) which specified that federal funds could not be used to draw up plans to prevent students from attending the schools of their parents' choice on the basis of race or color. Senator Magnuson noted that the compromise worked out in conference did not please everyone--that the appropriations bill was not the place to deal with such issues. Sen. Jacob Javits (R-N.Y.) described the amendments as "an albatross." Senator Stennis, who favored the Whitten amendments, observed that they "mean exactly what they say" and it will be up to the executive branch to enforce them.

But Sen. Charles McC. Mathias (R-Md.) claimed the Whitten amendments would not prevent the elimination of de jure segregation in the South. He quoted a July 20, 1970, letter from HEW Secy. Elliot L. Richardson in which he declared: "The proposed provisions neither change basic law nor affect HEW regulations. The Department's obligation and commitment to conduct the school desegregation program in accordance with the nondiscrimination requirements of Title VI (of the Civil Rights Act) and constitutional standards, therefore, would remain unaffected by adoption of Sections 209 and 210 (the Whitten amendments)."

Impact Aid

The bill provides $551 million for aid to schools in federally impacted areas, $126 million more than the President's request and $30 million over fiscal 1970. This controversial section dates back to 1950 when it was enacted to aid school districts financially burdened by new or expanded federal activities. President Nixon has repeatedly cited impact aid as a prime example of outmoded and unfair legislation. The administration currently has before Congress proposals to overhaul impact aid.

During floor debate on appropriations, impact aid was singled out by opponents and proponents as in need of updating, but all agreed this should be dealt with by legislative rather than appropriations committees. Senator Cotton pointed out that since the program started in 1951 it has absorbed a total of $5.2 billion, and yearly amounts have increased from $29 million to $536 million. "The reason that the school districts and the people of this country are so vitally interested in impacted area funds," Cotton explained, "is that they are the only funds in this whole $4 billion bill that go into the school districts with no strings attached, so that local school boards can use them for their most pressing needs."

Elementary and Secondary Education

The 1971 appropriations bill contains $1.8 billion for elementary and secondary education programs. This is $232 million over both the President's request and the fiscal 1970 budget.

A proposal by the President to allow $1.3 billion for fiscal 1972 advance funding for Title I (aid to the disadvantaged) was knocked out of the bill in both House and Senate appropriations committees. The principle of advance funding was designed to give school administrators some idea of the amount of Title I funds they could expect in the upcoming school year. It was "disallowed" in both the fiscal 1970 and 1971 versions of the bill. The action, in which the Senate concurred, was explained in the House report: "The Committee has not seen any persuasive evidence that an advance appropriation is really helpful to the states and school districts if it is not known whether there will be additional appropriations for the same purpose in the next session of Congress." It added that enactment "early in each session of Congress of a regular education appropriations bill will help the schools a great deal more than advance appropriations." Despite the loss of advance funding, Title I came out ahead in the fiscal 1971 measure. Its $1.5 billion funding level was $161 million more than both the President's request and fiscal 1970. The federal money will serve some 7,900,000 children concentrated in local school districts which have large numbers of children from low-income families. According to the House report, most of these funds will be required for normal annual increases in per-pupil costs. HEW's Urban Education Task Force noted that per-pupil costs in central cities, where most disadvantaged pupils are located, is considerably higher than in suburban areas.

For Title II (library resources), which includes the "Right To Read" program, the bill allows $80 million, the amount requested by the President. This is a $37.5 million increase over fiscal 1970.

The bill provides $143 million for Title III (supplemental services), which is $23 million more than the President's request and $12.5 million more than fiscal 1970.

The bill adds $50 million for equipment and minor remodeling under the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) equipment section. This money was not in the President's budget request.

Title V, ESEA (strengthening state departments of education), was funded at $29.7 million, which was the level requested by the President and the same as fiscal 1970.

Title VII (bilingual education) was funded at $25 million, a $3.7 million increase over both the level recommended by the President and the fiscal 1970 appropriation.

Dropout prevention, under Title VIII of ESEA, was one of the few programs cut back in the appropriations bill. It was mentioned by the President as a reason for his veto. He had asked for $15 million for the program which was funded at $5 million in fiscal 1970. Congress granted $10 million.

A $2 million appropriation for school nutrition and health programs under section 808 of ESEA was added in the Senate bill but knocked out in conference. The President's budget made no request for this section.

The $9.2 million in the President's budget recommendation for planning and evaluation was cut to $8.8 million in the appropriations measure.

Education for the Handicapped

The bill provides $105 million for education of the handicapped. This is $20 million over fiscal 1970 and $10 million more than the President asked.

The state grant program, funded at $34 million, is increased by $2 million over the President's recommendation and $4.8 million over fiscal 1970. This will provide special services to 12,000 more children than the 182,000 provided for under the budget request.

For early childhood projects, the allowance was $7 million, an increase of $3 million over the President's recommendation and $4 million over fiscal 1970. This will provide funds for the operation and technical support of 75 centers.

For teacher education and recruitment, the bill provides $33.1 million, $1 million more than the President's request and $2.6 million over the fiscal 1970 appropriation. According to the Senate report, this will allow for the development of new methods for training teachers and leadership personnel and permit the training in special study institutes of an additional 500 teachers and administrators.

For research and demonstration, the bill provides $15.3 million, an increase of $850,000 over the President's recommendation and $1.9 million over fiscal 1970. The additional funds will be used for demonstration and dissemination of techniques for the prevention of educational handicaps in preschool children.

For deaf-blind centers, the bill provides $4.5 million, a $2 million increase over the President's request and $2.5 million more than fiscal 1970. The money will provide services to deaf-blind children through regional centers and programs which, according to the Senate report, will help 10% of the approximately 4,000 children with this dual handicap.

For the recently enacted special program for children with specific learning disabilities, the bill provides $1 million. The President's budget made no request for this program. It is expected that the $1 million appropriation will be sufficient to cover starting costs of this program during the first year.

Vocational Education

The bill contains $494 million for vocational and adult education, a $75 million increase over the fiscal year 1970 appropriation and $54 million more than the President's request. The largest part of this money--$315 million--is earmarked for state grants. This is $15 million more than the President's request. The money is to be used for state programs to prepare more young people for productive employment, especially in new and emerging occupations. The bill provides $56 million for research and innovation to develop new methods and techniques for updating vocational education, an increase of $41 million over 1970 and $31 million more than the President's budget.

Higher Education

The total appropriation for higher education is $968 million, which is $117 million more than fiscal 1970 and $110 million over the President's recommendation. These funds include $766 million for a variety of student assistance programs. The $18 million cut in the Educational Opportunity Grant (EOG) program was another reason cited by President Nixon for his veto. He had asked for $186 million for this program which is specifically designed to make higher education possible for students of exceptional financial need. Congress appropriated $168 million for the EOG program, a $3 million increase over fiscal 1970. The College Work-Study program, which makes grants to institutions to help them operate work-study programs for needy students, was funded at $160 million, the level requested by the President, a $6 million increase over fiscal 1970. Other special programs for the disadvantaged, Talent Search and Upward Bound, were funded at the level requested by the President. Talent Search will receive $5 million, the same as fiscal 1970, and Upward Bound, $30 million, a $363,000 increase over fiscal 1970.

The bill adds $10 million for land grant colleges under the Bankhead-Jones Act. The President's budget called for the elimination of this program.

Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Texas) observed that higher education "did not fare well" in conference. He noted that funds for construction under the Higher Education Facilities Act are limited to $43 million for community colleges. The Senate had added $28 million for construction at four-year institutions, but this was cut back in conference. This is "not a true saving," Yarborough said. "It is only a postponement which will cost more later."

Community Education—Libraries

The bill contains $85 million for community education programs, which include support of public libraries, college and university libraries, and educational broadcasting facilities. This is an $18 million increase over fiscal 1970 and $26 million more than the President's request. For public libraries, the bill allows $41 million, $5 million more than both the President's request and fiscal 1970. Another $7 million is appropriated for the construction of public libraries. No funds for them were included in the President's budget. The bill provides $15 million for college library resources, a $5 million increase over both the President's request and fiscal 1970. It also provides $11 million for educational broadcasting facilities, $7 million more than the President's request and $6 million more than fiscal 1970.

Research and Training

Research has become the principal arena of combat between the President and Congress in the field of education. Emphasized by the President in his message on education reform, research was one of the few places in the education budget he recommended for increases. The President asked for $118 million for research and training, which represented a $37 million increase over fiscal 1970. Congress took a $28 million bite out of his request, paring it back to $90 million. The President took particular note of this in his veto

Where To Get More Information

Additional information concerning federal education appropriations for fiscal year 1971 may be obtained by writing or calling the Budget and Manpower Division, Office of Administration, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 962-1085. Educators may receive complimentary copies of 1970-71 appropriations legislation, technically known as Public Law 91-380, by writing their representative in Congress.

message, charging that Congress raised spending levels for "old approaches" and cut requests for "forward-looking programs."

A proposal to establish experimental model schools, the innovative program pushed by former HEW Secy. Robert H. Finch, suffered a $10 million cut. The President had requested $25 million for this program; the bill provides $15 million. The Senate report comments: "The committee feels that considerable innovative and experimental work can be carried out under Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and, as a result, does not see the need for such a large amount for a wholly federally directed program."

The President's $22.5 million request for general education research was slashed to $15 million, a $7.5 million decrease from the fiscal year 1970 appropriation. The Senate report explains: "The committee is singularly unimpressed with much of this research and believes that a significant reduction can be made here without impairing the most important basic research efforts."

The House report on the appropriations bill takes a similar attitude toward research. It recommends that USOE "take a hard look" at its current research programs to determine whether they are "really targeted" on finding answers to the questions raised by the President in his message on education reform.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

The 1970 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) signed into law by President Nixon on April 13, 1970, is the largest authorization bill ever enacted for elementary and secondary education programs. It extends the landmark ESEA legislation for three more years, through fiscal 1973, and authorizes a grand total of $24.8 billion. President Nixon signed the new ESEA measure with "considerable reluctance," explaining that he viewed its authorization level as both "excessive and misdirected." He noted that the $7.1 billion level of spending authorized for fiscal 1971 is considerably higher than the $3.8 billion appropriated for education in fiscal 1970. In addition, the measure authorizes $7.7 billion for fiscal 1972 and $9.9 billion for fiscal 1973.

These spending levels are more in line with the $7 to 14 billion yearly budget for education recommended by the Urban Education Task Force. The group, appointed by former HEW Secretary Finch in March 1969 to make a long-range study of big city schools and their problems, concluded: "Without adequate funding, there is no hope for effective education in the cities." Its findings, never officially released by HEW, were inserted in the Congressional Record by Rep. Jeffery Cohelan (D-Calif.) and reprinted in a Special Report, Urban School Crisis, by the Editors of Education U.S.A.

The ESEA bill, which had an extended one-year journey through Congress, won final passage in the Senate on April 1, 1970, by an overwhelming 74-4 vote and cleared the House on April 7, 1970, by a 312-58 roll call vote. Much of the debate in the Senate centered on an amendment by Sen. John Stennis (D-Miss.) calling for uniform nationwide enforcement of school desegregation. He was supported by Sen. Abraham Ribicoff (D-Conn.), who argued that Northern states are guilty of hypocrisy when they practice de facto segregation by housing patterns, which he claimed is essentially the same as de jure segregation by law. The Stennis amendment passed the Senate but was watered down in conference to restate the current interpretation--that de jure segregation is illegal but de facto segregation is not.

The new ESEA legislation consolidates some categories of existing aid and creates several new programs. It extends the controversial aid for federally impacted areas for three more years and adds children in low-rent public housing. President Nixon, who favors reform of impacted aid legislation, commented that the addition of public housing children to the impacted aid section "compounds that program's inequities."

In another major change, the new ESEA bill increases the maximum family income level for determining eligibility under Title I. The bill also pro-

vides salary bonus payments for teachers in Title I schools. In addition to the elementary and secondary education titles, the bill also contains several new titles. It consolidates all legislation for handicapped children into a single title, and extends certain existing vocational, adult, and higher education programs.

One of the most important changes as far as elementary and secondary school officials are concerned is a new provision allowing state and local administrators to carry over to the next school year unused funds from the last fiscal year. An amendment added to section 405 of the bill by Sen. Joseph Tydings (D-Md.) allows state and local officials to spend fiscal 1970 education funds in fiscal 1971. Senator Tydings explained: "This amendment would permit school districts for the next three fiscal years to carry over unexpended federal funds received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act into the succeeding fiscal year."

He said such an amendment was necessary in order to allow state and local school officials ample time to plan and carry out the efficient expenditure of federal education funds. Because of delays in the passage of annual appropriations bills, school districts often have only the last four or five months in a fiscal year when they know how much money they actually can expect in that year. The fact that the unspent money would go back to the U.S. Treasury at the end of the fiscal year often caused local officials to make inefficient or wasteful expenditures in order to avoid losing the money, Tydings noted.

In an opinion handed down by Assistant General Counsel for Education Harry J. Chernock, HEW ruled that as of April 13, 1970, the date President Nixon signed the ESEA amendments, school districts may carry unused funds over to the next school year. An official in USOE's Office of Legislation noted that the ruling applies to all programs administered by the Office of Education--not just elementary and secondary education.

The problem of late funding is recognized by many members of Congress as one of the kinks in the pipeline of federal aid to education. Senator Yarborough commented: "It is important to stress that with this version, we intend major education programs to be appropriated for a year in advance. Many educational programs have suffered from insufficient lead time. Educators and administrators who do not know what to expect from Congress in terms of budget support cannot afford to spend a lot of time organizing and planning a course or program whose chances of being funded are slight or unknown."

Here is how the new amendments affect specific ESEA programs:

Education of Disadvantaged Children (Title I)

Title I, the largest single federal aid to education program, has, since passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, provided to state and local educational agencies more than $4 billion for the education of disadvantaged children. An estimated 9 million children took part in Title I programs in the 1968-69 school year. Approximately 16,400 of the nation's 18,904 public school districts participated in the program.

Comparability--Perhaps the most controversial and far-reaching section of the new legislation, comparability requires Title I funds to be used to supplement rather than supplant state and local funds. This means that local school districts receiving Title I funds must provide comparable services and spend as much per pupil on schools in poor neighborhoods as they spend in schools in more affluent areas. Richard L. Fairley, acting director of USOE's Division of Compensatory Education, says the gap in some school districts between spending on Title I schools and non-Title I schools is as much as $500 per pupil. "The whole idea of Title I," he comments, "is to provide extra services for eligible children, not to make up for what the state and local school district is providing to other children."

Comparability is not a new issue. It has always been implicit in the law, but now schools must submit data to prove they are providing comparable services. If they cannot prove this, USOE has a Congressional mandate to cut off their Title I funds. Beginning July 1, 1972, a state educational agency may withhold funds from a local school district which has not complied with the comparability requirement. Because information of this scale and scope has never been required, Congress insisted that districts be given time to plan for implementation. Under the new ruling, which is expected to sharply increase paperwork of school administrators, state agencies will require districts to either: (1) submit data by July 1, 1971, and preferably by May 1, 1971, demonstrating that comparability between Title I and non-Title I schools already exists; or (2) submit a plan, including budget projections, to show that comparability will be achieved by June 30, 1972. Districts with only one school serving the grade level in which Title I services are provided need not submit any data. Districts with a Title I allocation of less than $50,000 do not have to report their instructional expenses but must submit an assurance that comparability exists. To continue receiving Title I money, school districts must show that spending from state and local funds on Title I schools is comparable (equal to or higher than) their spending on non-Title I schools.

USOE's comparability guidelines do not require the transfer of teachers from one school to another, although teacher salaries must be included in the estimate of instructional costs. The estimate may be computed on the base salary for each teaching job. It does not have to include raises for longevity or tenure. Fear that senior teachers would be asked to teach in Title I schools was one of the points that held up approval of the guidelines by organizations such as the American Assn. of School Administrators and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

The comparability guidelines require a local school district to submit data for each school included in its Title I application and the average for all non-Title I schools. A 5% variance is permitted. The following data (based only on state and local funds) is required:

- The average number of certified teachers
- The average number of other certified instructional personnel
- The average number of noncertified instructional personnel
- The total expended for instructional salaries
- The amount included in instructional salaries that is based solely on length of service
- Other instructional costs (including textbooks, library books, audio-

For More Information

For copies of the Title I, ESEA, comparability guidelines and further information write to: Information Office, Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 962-1766.

visual materials, and other teaching supplies)
- Average daily membership
- Additional data that the state may choose to require.

Once local school districts have collected their data, the state educational agency is responsible for determining whether the districts are in compliance with the comparability requirement. The state will base its determination on:

- Ratio of pupils to certified teachers
- Ratio of pupils to other certified instructional personnel
- Ratio of pupils to noncertified instructional personnel
- Per-pupil expenditure for instructional salaries (minus the amount paid solely for length of service)
- Per-pupil expenditure for other instructional costs.

Bonus Pay--Section 108 under the Title I amendments permits the payment of special bonuses, in excess of regular salaries, to teachers in schools with a high concentration of educationally deprived children. Originally sponsored by Rep. Edith Green (D-Oreg.) as a "combat pay" amendment to the House bill, the provision was deleted in the Senate. The conference committee adopted the House language specifying that bonus payments should be permitted only for teachers in schools with "an exceptionally high concentration of children from low income families." USOE's guidelines on bonus pay say that only teachers who are "an integral part" of the Title I program are eligible. Initially, bonus pay will be given to teachers in local school districts for a two-year trial period. In order to continue getting funds for bonus pay, the school district must be able to prove that the funds were effective in getting and keeping high caliber teachers, and that teachers getting bonus pay contributed to the improvement of Title I students' performance.

Parent Involvement--The legislation authorizes the Commissioner of Education to determine what educational programs would be enhanced by parental involvement and to make such involvement a requirement in those programs. Parental involvement has been a requirement of Title I, but the new legislation gives additional emphasis to this regulation and further directs agencies to establish policies and procedures that will insure the involvement of parents in the planning and operation of Title I programs, give them an opportunity to express their views of a program application, and make program plans and evaluations accessible to parents.

Incentive Payments to States--Part B of the Title I amendments allows an incentive grant for states surpassing the national effort in elementary and secondary education expenditures. The national figure is the ratio of all nonfederal expenditures for public elementary and secondary education to

the total personal income in the 50 states and the District of Columbia. If a state's effort, based on state expenditures and total personal income, exceeds the national level, the state educational agency is eligible for an incentive grant under Title I.

Urban and Rural Education Grants--A new Part C in Title I provides special grants for urban and rural school districts with the highest concentration of disadvantaged children. At least 20% of the district's population, age 5 to 17, must be children of low-income families, or at least 5,000 children and 5% of that age bracket must be in the poverty count. A special provision allows certain school districts just short of meeting these numerical criteria but in dire need of additional aid to apply for a special grant. This may be done, however, only with the approval of the state educational agency and the U.S. Commissioner of Education. This new Part C is basically an incorporation of the Urban and Rural Education Bill introduced in 1969 by Sen. George Murphy (R-Calif.).

Raise in Income Level--The family income level for determining eligibility for Title I projects is increased from a maximum of $3,000 per year to $4,000. However, this is essentially meaningless under current appropriations. Title I is now funded only at the $2,000 level and not even fully funded at this level.

Public Information--The new legislation designates all Title I applications and "pertinent documents" as public information and, therefore, available for examination by the public. State educational agencies and local school districts must be able to demonstrate that such data (and required reports and evaluations affecting Title I) are available to interested parties.

Performance Criteria--In order to obtain a better idea of what works in compensatory education and to assure better evaluation at all levels, Congress included a provision which, in effect, requires local educational agencies to state in advance the criteria by which their Title I program will be evaluated. In addition, state educational agencies must report annually on the results of research and replication studies which have implications for Title I. This does not mean that Title I funds will be used for basic research, but that a portion of the state educational agency's administrative funds will be used to summarize relevant research conducted in the state.

Neglected and Delinquent Children--Several ESEA amendments are particularly applicable to the Title I program for institutionalized neglected or delinquent children. One provides that a state educational agency, after determining that a local school district is unwilling to provide for the special educational needs of institutionalized children in its area, may assume responsibility for those children and, therefore, receive that portion of the local educational agency's Title I funds which is attributable to such children. Under the amendment, all children (age 5 to 17) in correctional institutions are to be counted as institutionalized delinquent children. A second provision makes Puerto Rico and other outlying areas eligible to apply for Title I funds to serve institutionalized children.

Migrant Children--The ESEA amendments permit USOE to adjust state allocations for migrant education as determined by a formula based on the number

of migratory agricultural workers in each state. The adjustments can be made on the basis of data indicating that more or less children are actually served than the formula allows. The amendment provides that funds not needed for migrant education in one state be reallocated to another state. In the past, such funds were reallocated to other school districts within the state.

Withholding of Funds for Noncompliance--Beginning in fiscal year 1971, funds appropriated for school districts not in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act will be used by the U.S. Commissioner of Education for special grants under Title IV of that act. However, such grants must go to the state from which the funds were withheld.

Library Resources, Textbooks, and Instructional Materials (Title II)

Title II of ESEA provided for the first time, direct financial assistance to public school libraries for the purchase of textbooks and other instructional materials for the use of children in public and private elementary and secondary schools. An average of 39 million public and 5 million private school children benefited from the loan of materials purchased under Title II in fiscal 1966 to 1969, according to the Senate report on the ESEA bill.

Title II spending for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials totaled $357 million over this four-year period. Over 120 million audiovisual items were made available under Title II. They included motion pictures, filmstrips, recordings, slides and transparencies, programmed instructional materials, maps, charts, and globes.

The new legislation extends Title II without amendments and sets an authorization level of $200 million for fiscal 1971, $210 million for fiscal 1972, and $220 million for fiscal 1973.

Supplementary Educational Centers and Services (Title III)

The new legislation consolidates Title III of ESEA with Title V-A of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA)--guidance, counseling, and testing --and extends the combined program for three years with authorizations of

New Ruling: Clothing Payments Under Title I

As the result of confrontations with welfare mothers who proposed to use Title I funds to buy clothing for their children in the program, a new guideline on clothing was issued by USOE on Sept. 15, 1970. It stated that Title I is "an educational, not a welfare program," and that clothing should be provided as a supplementary service "only in emergency situations." The guideline cautioned state agencies not to approve "any increase over previous years' expenditures" for clothing. However, on Oct. 6, 1970, HEW Secy. Elliot L. Richardson removed the ceiling on the amount of Title I money that could be used for clothing.

$550 million for fiscal 1971, $575 million for fiscal 1972, and $605 million for fiscal 1973.

The consolidation of ESEA Titles II and III with NDEA Titles III-A and V-A was recommended by President Nixon in his fiscal 1971 budget. It was supported in the House but opposed in the Senate. Senator Javits, a member of the House-Senate Conference Committee, touched on some of the controversy in a speech during Senate debate on the new ESEA bill. He noted that House conferees favored consolidating various titles of aid with grants to states to be made in a lump sum. "The House insisted on a massive consolidation, which, in our judgment, completely blotted it out," said Javits, describing the position of the Senate conferees. Afer "hard bargaining," Javits said the Senate conferees worked out a "modest consolidation."

Senator Yarborough, also one of the conferees, said: "The Senate rejected consolidation because we know that categorical programs are established in order to give identity and separate funding to the activities we are trying to stimulate. Lumping educational activities into one authorization often means that one loses out to others in proportions Congress did not intend."

Supporters of Title III have been complaining that their part of ESEA --educational innovation--has been downgraded and is suffering from dwindling federal aid. "Amidst national plenty, educational innovation is short-changed," stated the Second Annual Report of the National Advisory Council on Supplementary Centers and Services. The Council argued that consolidation would destroy the innovative and creative thrust of Title III "by tying innovative funds into a program involving local district fund allotments." Title III would become a "hardware program," the Council warned. A Council survey found that consolidation is opposed by 71% of the Title III state coordinators and 64% of the project directors.

The following are highlights of the new Title III legislation:

- Specifies that each state must spend at least half as much as it spent in fiscal 1970 under Title V-A (NDEA) for guidance, counseling, and testing.

- Allows the U.S. Commissioner of Education to reserve 15% of Title III funds for outside state programs.

During the first three years of operation from 1965 to 1968, Title III projects were directly administered by USOE. The 1967 amendments to the ESEA bill transferred administration of 75% of the programs to the states, with the remaining 25% left to the discretion of the U.S. Commissioner of Education. By 1969, all Title III programs were being administered by the states. The latest amendment restores 15% of the funds to the Commissioner.

According to the Senate committee report, state-federal funding of these projects "appears to inhibit real opportunities for the Commissioner to advance ideas and techniques which he determines to be imaginative." Under his new mandate, the Commissioner may fund certain projects that hold promise to benefit all states. They could include, for example, projects in urban problems, migrant education, ecology, and reading.

Strengthening State Departments of Education

The present program under Title V of ESEA is extended for three years with authorizations of $80 million for fiscal 1971, $85 million for fiscal 1972, and $90 million for fiscal 1973. This program makes basic grants to all states to help them improve their management techniques, and provides know-how to local school districts on new curriculum materials, teacher preparation, planning, and demonstration projects.

The new legislation adds several new provisions:

- Allows the use of Title V funds for programs for the education of gifted and talented children.

- A new Part B authorizes direct grants to local educational agencies to strengthen their leadership resources and to assist them in setting up programs to meet the educational needs of their districts. The Senate committee report notes that this legislation is designed to do at the local level what the 1965 ESEA bill did at the state level. It points out that the "time lag" between the discovery and application of new ideas in education "is as much as 30 years." Innovation at the local level is the expected by-product of this legislation, according to the report. "In the final analysis, it is at the local level where the product of our educational knowledge is delivered to the ultimate consumer, the American child," the report states.

- A new Part C authorizes grants to state and local educational agencies to help them improve their planning and evaluation services, with $10 million for fiscal 1971, $15 million for fiscal 1972, and $20 million for fiscal 1973. These funds may be used to hire trained people to organize and carry out major planning and evaluation efforts at the state level and to provide technical assistance in planning and evaluating the programs of local school districts. The Senate report notes that present statewide planning and evaluation is "wholly inadequate." It observes that the new Part C authorization should put state and local school systems in a better and stronger position. "Having the resources, they would be able to formulate their own education goals and priorities. They would be better able to choose among the many federal programs available to them and would have the added advantage of allowing for a coordinated use of their own resources."

- Part D calls for the establishment of a National Council on Quality in Education. Its members would be appointed by the President and report directly to him. The idea is to give more prestige than the present setup under the Title V Advisory Committee which reports to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Members of the Council have yet to be appointed. It also permits the establishment of similar state advisory councils. The program must be administered by a separate planning and evaluation unit in the agency granting the funds.

Education of the Handicapped

Since 1967, with the establishment of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped in the U.S. Office of Education, the federal commitment to edu-

cation of the handicapped has been expanded with programs for the deaf-blind, regional resource centers, and special preschool programs.

The new legislation is principally a codification and refinement of existing programs. It repeals separate authorities for USOE programs for the handicapped and creates a single "Education for the Handicapped Act" under ESEA.

Following are some of the highlights:

Part B authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to assist states in the initiation, expansion, and improvement of projects and programs for the education of handicapped children at preschool, elementary, and secondary school levels, with an authorization of $200 million for fiscal 1971, $210 million for fiscal 1972, and $220 million for fiscal 1973.

Part C authorizes support for centers and services to meet special needs of the handicapped. This includes programs for regional resource centers and services for deaf-blind children, and early education for handicapped children. The regional resource centers are designed to provide a national network of centers to develop and apply the best methods of appraising the special educational needs of handicapped children and to provide the appropriate services to assist in meeting such needs. The program for establishing centers and services for deaf-blind children is a response to the needs created by the crisis caused by the rubella (German measles) epidemic of 1964-65, when an estimated 20,000 to 30,000 children were affected with deafness, blindness, or a combination of both. The programs for preschool-age handicapped children support a network of model centers which provide comprehensive services to handicapped children and also encourage participation of parents and the involvement of the community. Other sections of Part C call for evaluation and provide funds for research, innovation, training, and dissemination activities in connection with the various types of centers described above. The legislation authorized $36.5 million for fiscal 1971, $51.5 million for fiscal 1972, and $66.5 million for fiscal 1973.

Part D authorizes grants to institutions of higher education, state educational agencies, and other appropriate institutions for the training of personnel in the field of education of the handicapped. Authorizations include $69.5 million for fiscal 1971, $87 million for fiscal 1972, and $103.5 million for fiscal 1973.

Part E authorizes research and demonstration projects, including projects in physical education and recreation for handicapped children. It replaces sections 302 and 502 of PL 88-164 (mental retardation bill). Under the legislation, grants are made to colleges and research organizations. For example, Rice U. in Houston, Texas, received a contract for a study of normal and emotionally disturbed children, age 7 to 10. The fiscal 1971 authorization for the program is $27 million, with $35.5 million for fiscal 1972, and $45 million for fiscal 1973.

Part F continues the Bureau's program of captioned films and educational media material for handicapped persons. Started in 1958 for the instruction of the deaf, it has been enlarged to include all categories of handicapped.

For More Information

For further information on aid to the handicapped, write to: Lee Ross, Chief, Information Division, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Room 2004, Regional Office Building, 7th and D Sts., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 962-1478.

The legislation also authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, which would promote new educational technology and the designing, developing, and adapting of instructional materials. This program is not yet in operation. The amendments authorize $12.5 million for fiscal 1971, $15 million for fiscal 1972, and $20 million for fiscal 1973.

Part G calls for a new program of research, training, and model centers for the improvement of education of children with specific learning disabilities. The National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children describes these as "disorders in one or more of the basic psychological processes involved in understanding or using spoken or written languages." They may manifest themselves in listening, talking, and reading and may affect a child's ability in reading, writing, spelling, or arithmetic. The Committee estimates that about 1 to 3% of U.S. children have such learning disabilities. Authorizations for this section include $20 million for fiscal 1971 and $31 million for both fiscal 1972 and 1973.

Bilingual Education

The bilingual education program administered by USOE under Title VII, ESEA, meets the special educational needs of children, age 3 to 18, who have limited English-speaking ability and who come from homes where the dominant language is other than English. Bilingual instruction means the use of two languages, one of which is English. In order to qualify under Title VII, a school must serve a high concentration of children of limited English-speaking ability who come from families earning less than $3,000 per year, or receiving payments through a program of aid to families with dependent children. The new legislation authorizes $80 million for this program for fiscal 1971, $100 million for fiscal 1972, and $135 million for fiscal 1973. A new section provides for the participation of children living on Indian reservations and attending tribal schools or schools administered by the Interior Dept.'s Bureau of Indian Affairs. This section is designed "to encourage Indian participation in, and control of, their own bilingual education programs." It is clearly intended to apply to schools such as the Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation in Arizona, which is operated by an all-Indian school board elected by the Navajo people.

Dropout Prevention

Section 807 was added to ESEA in the 1967 amendments and first funded in fiscal 1969 with a $5 million appropriation for 10 dropout prevention projects. Experimental in concept, the projects were initiated principally

in districts where the dropout rate was high. The aim was to use new methods and approaches to keep students in school. Preliminary reports from Baltimore and St. Louis projects show a significant decrease in their dropout rate. The new legislation extends existing dropout programs, with authorizations of $30 million for fiscal 1971, $31.5 million for fiscal 1972, and $33 million for fiscal 1973.

Nutrition and Health Services

The key areas of school services which are not meeting the special needs of children from low-income families are nutrition and health services, according to the Senate report. "Children who are hungry, sick, or emotionally isolated do not feel like learning. Money spent on special educational programs for children from low-income families is of limited usefulness unless an effort is made to get children in condition to learn," the report notes. The new legislation amends Title VIII of ESEA to authorize a program of grants for demonstration projects designed to improve nutrition and health services in public and private schools serving areas with high concentrations of children from low-income families. USOE is given responsibility for the program, which is to be coordinated with other agencies with interests in nutrition and health services, such as the Office of Economic Opportunity's Neighborhood Health Centers; HEW's Comprehensive Centers, Community Mental Health Centers, and Children and Youth Projects; and child feeding services conducted by the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture. Local educational agencies are authorized to receive grants to conduct the demonstration projects. Nonpublic school children may be included in these projects.

Although the legislation authorizes $10 million for fiscal 1971, $16 million for fiscal 1972, and $26 million for fiscal 1973, no money has actually been appropriated for these projects in fiscal 1971. USOE is currently conducting seven pilot projects under an existing legislative authority, Title IV, ESEA, the cooperative research section.

Aid to Federally Impacted Areas

The program of aid to federally impacted areas, enacted as PL 81-815 and PL 81-874 in 1950, was designed to aid school districts financially burdened by new or expanded federal activities. During the 1969-70 school year, funds were provided on behalf of 2.85 million students in 4,500 school districts across the country. Impact aid is most attractive to school administrators becuase it contains no fund-matching requirements. Federal funds paid to an eligible district may be used for current school expenses in the same manner that general funds are used.

Want To Know More?

For additional information on school nutrition and health programs, write to: Office of Nutrition and Health Services, Room 2102, U.S. Office of Education, 400 Maryland Ave., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 962-1101.

President Nixon cited impacted area aid as one of the prime reasons for his veto of the first version of the 1970 Labor-HEW appropriations bill. He called the program "unfair" and noted that Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson all had criticized it. "Yet the Congress in this bill not only perpetuates this unfair program but adds more money to it." Congress voted $520.6 million for impact aid in the fiscal 1970 appropriations bill finally approved by the President. This was almost three times more than his $187 million fiscal 1970 budget request for the program. The President's fiscal 1971 budget contained $551 million for impacted area aid. However, a bill before Congress in the fall of 1970, introduced by Rep. Albert Quie (R-Minn.), contains the Administration's recommendations for reforming the program. Based on the findings of a study by the Battelle Memorial Institute, the reforms would continue aid to "A" category pupils (those whose parents live and work on federal property) and reduce benefits to "B" category pupils (those whose parents either work or live on federal property). This would greatly reduce the cost of the program.

Congress, however, views impacted aid in a different light. The extremely popular program touches 385 out of the nation's 435 congressional districts. Advocates of increased school funding succeeded in making the fiscal 1970 appropriations bill more attractive to many members of Congress by adding a so-called "sweetener," increased funds for impacted areas. The impacted aid section of the new ESEA legislation goes even further by adding a whole new category--public housing children. PL 815 and PL 874 are extended to authorize payments to local educational agencies for children who live in low-rent public housing. There are an estimated 1.4 million children living in public housing. This could add approximately $290 million to impacted aid and push the grand total for the program to over $1 billion. However, there is a proviso in the legislation stipulating that no payments may be made for children in public housing until all payments are made for the children whose parents live and/or work on federal property. The legislation authorizes $1,105,350,000 for fiscal 1971.

Adult Education

Many of the 1.26 million adults who have participated in the adult basic education program authorized by the Adult Education Act of 1966 have advanced as far as the eighth grade but have not been able to continue their education because the legislation did not include a provision for going on to high school.

The new legislation extends and amends the 1966 Act to include secondary-level education for adults. The Senate report explains: "In many in-

Where To Get More Information

For more information on changes in adult education programs, write to: Paul V. Delker, Director, Division of Adult Education Programs, Office of Education, Room 5082, Regional Office Building #3, 7th and D Sts., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 963-7444.

stances a high degree of motivation or the effective use of programmed instruction and educational technology leads an adult to earn two or three years of high school credits in but one year."

Authorizations include $200 million for fiscal 1971 and $225 million for both fiscal 1972 and 1973.

Administration of the U.S. Office of Education

Over the last 19 years, education legislation has developed piece by piece and general provisions relating to the authority of the U.S. Commissioner of Education have "proliferated" to the point of "general confusion," according to the Senate report. The new legislation codifies these provisions into a single body of law. Among its provisions:

- The U.S. Commissioner of Education is now required to combine all his annual reports on the programs he administers, plus all advisory council reports submitted to him, into a single annual report to be transmitted to Congress by March 31 of each year.

- Authorizes up to $25 million a year to be spent on planning and evaluation of USOE programs. Formerly there was no specific amount earmarked for planning and evaluation.

- Authorizing legislation for any education program may be automatically extended for an additional year, unless Congress by resolution provides otherwise, or unless Congress has passed or formally rejected such legislation.

- When the U.S. Commissioner of Education feels parental involvement would increase the effectiveness of certain education programs, he is authorized to encourage it.

- All legislation dealing with advisory councils--special panels of experts appointed to aid USOE develop policy and programs--is codified into one section which spells out details on terms of members, compensation, staffing, and reporting requirements.

Student Loans

Under the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), a student who becomes a teacher qualifies for certain amounts of forgiveness of his National Defense Student Loan. The new legislation expands the forgiveness clause to include forgiveness for service in the Armed Forces after June 30, 1970.

AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH ACT

A major step forward has been taken to expand and to improve the school lunch program for the nation's needy children. The action came in the form of significant new amendments to the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966. The landmark legislation, which will directly affect more than 75,000 schools, was signed by President Nixon on May 14, 1970. Final Congressional action came May 4 when the House, by a voice vote, approved the Senate-House conference report on the measure. The Senate, also by a voice vote, adopted the report on April 30, 1970.

The new law (PL 91-248) makes a bold promise. It says all needy children must be offered free or reduced-price lunches, with top priority going to the most needy. The report on the bill by the House Committee on Education and Labor put it this way: "The bill requires meals to be served without cost or at reduced cost to children unable to pay the full cost of the lunch."

In addition, the Committee said, the bill "requires that such children be determined by a systematic plan applied to all families on the basis of need criteria which includes: (1) level of family income, and (2) number of members in the family."

Funding to meet much of the bill's promise has won support from both Congress and the Administration, informed observers report. The appropriation for all child feeding programs for fiscal 1971 is expected to be slightly over $876 million, compared to only $664 million in fiscal 1970. This means, according to the Dept. of Agriculture, that the programs will be servicing at least 6.6 million needy children, compared to 5.2 million needy children at the end of fiscal year 1970.

Additional highlights of the new law include the following:

Each state must contribute specific funding for the program. "Relatively few states provided direct cash for program support in the schools," the Committee report said. Under PL 91-248 the states are required to provide at least 4% of the state-matching requirement from state tax revenues in fiscal years 1972 and 1973; for fiscal 1974 and 1975, 6%; for fiscal 1976 and 1977, 8%; and for each suceeding fiscal year, 10%.

- Federal appropriations are authorized one year in advance for child food programs. In addition, any funds appropriated to carry out the provision of the program "shall remain available for the purposes of the act for which appropriated until expended."

- The bill adds provisions specifically prohibiting the identification of any child receiving free or reduced-price meals under the Child Nutrition Act by the use of such devices as special tokens, tickets, or published lists of names.

- Nutritional training and education is promoted by permitting up to 1% of the funds to be used for grants to states for nutritional training and education for program participants and employees. In its discussion of this provision, the House Committee Report noted that testimony presented to the Committee made it clear "that a great many Americans of all economic levels are not very well informed of the subject of nutrition and its importance. Since the inauguration of the school lunch program more than 30 years ago," the Committee said, "it was felt that the serving of a Type A* lunch would serve to instill good nutritional habits in youngsters who were participating in the program. This obviously has not been the case," the report asserted.

---

* To receive federal aid for school lunch programs, schools must agree to serve nutritious lunches that meet the requirements for a Type A lunch as established by the Secretary of Agriculture. To meet the requirements of the Type A pattern, the lunch must contain: milk, meat or alternate, vegetables and/or fruits, bread and butter. This pattern is designed to meet one-third of the recommended daily dietary allowances for children.

- The bill shows a concern for schools which provide students with tempting alternatives to the school lunch program, like candy counters and snack bars which sell foods of negative nutritional value. To tackle this problem the bill permits the Secretary of Agriculture "to take a hard look at some of the competition to the balanced meal offered within schools and service institutions." After this "hard look" he is permitted to adopt remedial regulations.

- Cost of a reduced-price lunch cannot exceed 20 cents.

- Acquisition of equipment for school lunch programs is permitted by rental as well as by purchase.

- The following sums are authorized for nonfood assistance in amendments to the Child Nutrition Act of 1966: for fiscal year 1971, $38 million; for fiscal year 1972, $33 million; for fiscal year 1973, $15 million; and for each succeeding fiscal year, not to exceed $10 million. The Senate-House Conference report said this money can be used "to supply schools drawing attendance from areas in which poor economic conditions exist with equipment, other than land or buildings, for the storage, preparation, transportation, and serving of food to enable such schools to establish, maintain, and expand school food service programs."

- A state plan of child nutrition operations for the following year must be submitted not later than Jan. 1 of each year by each state educational agency to the Secretary of Agriculture. The state plan must include a description of how the state proposes (a) to use the funds

provided in this legislation and funds from sources within the state to furnish a free or reduced-price lunch to every needy child, and (b) to extend the school lunch program under this legislation to every school within the state.

- Each school participating in the school lunch program must submit a report each month to its state education agency. The report must include the average number of children in the school who received free lunches and the average number of children who received reduced-price lunches during the immediately preceding month. Each participating school must also provide an estimate, as of Oct. 1 and March 1 of each year, of the number of children who are eligible for a free or reduced-price lunch.

- A 13-member National Advisory Council of Child Nutrition appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture is ordered established. Its membership must include one school administrator, one person engaged in child welfare work, one person engaged in vocational education work, one nutrition expert, one school food service management expert, a state superintendent of schools, a state school lunch director, one school board member, one classroom teacher, four members who are officers or employees of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture and are specially qualified to serve on the Council because of their education, training experience, and knowledge in matters relating to food programs. The Council is required to make a continuing study of the operation of programs carried out under the National School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, and any related act which provides meals for children. Its goal is to determine how the food programs may be improved. A report must be submitted annually to the President and the Congress.

- The apportionment of funds to the states will be based on the total number of children in each state, age 3-17, in households with incomes of less than $4,000 annually.

- The appropriation authorization for the school breakfast program is set at $25 million for fiscal year 1971.

- Income and poverty guidelines to be used to determine eligible children will be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture as of July 1 of each year. "In providing meals free or at reduced cost to needy children, first priority shall be given to providing free meals to the neediest children," the Senate-House Conference Committee report said.

On Aug. 4, 1970, Agriculture Secy. Clifford M. Hardin announced the amended program's first national income poverty guidelines for determining children's eligibility for free or reduced-price lunches, as required by PL 91-248. "After Jan. 1, 1971," the Secretary said, "any child from a family with an income at or below the national income poverty guidelines shall be served a lunch, either free or at a reduced price (not to exceed 20 cents), in a school that is receiving federal school lunch cash or commodity assistance. The guidelines may be used voluntarily by schools as their income criteria until Jan. 1, when adoption becomes mandatory." The Secretary noted that private schools with programs administered by the Dept. of Agriculture are exempt from the guidelines under certain conditions.

The guidelines for qualification of child participation are as follows:

Total Family Size	48 States, D.C. and Outlying Areas*	Hawaii	Alaska
One	$1,920	$2,210	$2,400
Two	$2,520	$2,900	$3,150
Three	$3,120	$3,590	$3,900
Four	$3,720	$4,280	$4,650
Five	$4,270	$4,910	$5,340
Six	$4,820	$5,540	$6,025
Seven	$5,320	$6,115	$6,650
Eight	$5,820	$6,690	$7,275
For each addt'l. family member	Add $450	Add $520	Add $560

* "Outlying areas" include Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Secretary Hardin said these income poverty guidelines were derived from the latest statistics on poverty levels reported by the Bureau of the Census. Variations for Hawaii and Alaska are consistent with such variations in the Office of Economic Opportunity poverty guidelines, he said. The new guidelines will apply for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971. Guidelines for future fiscal years will be announced as soon as possible after July 1, he said.

Private Firms Invited into Lunch Program

Federal regulations governing the school lunch program have been changed to permit schools to employ private firms to operate their food program. The goal: to promote innovation in the school lunch program. The change came on April 1, 1970, when the Dept. of Agriculture revised its guidelines "to permit any school food authority to employ a food service management company to conduct its feeding operations in one or more schools." Approved by Assistant Secy. of Agriculture Richard E. Lyng, the new government regulation says that a school food authority who employs a food service management company "remains responsible for seeing that the feeding operation is in conformance with its agreement with the state school lunch agency."

In announcing the revision of the regulation, Lyng said: "We hope to encourage food service management companies to find innovative ways to get meals into inner-city schools which lack cafeterias and to get meals to rural schools that lack facilities and transportation. We hope to reach as many additional needy children as possible."

As of Aug. 7, 1970, according to Dept. of Agriculture officials, only a few school districts have taken advantage of the new ruling permitting the employment of a private firm for food services. One such district is Detroit. During the 1969-70 school year, Detroit tried out the idea on a pilot basis in 16 schools, involving 12,000 pupils. The program, which featured the distribution of cold lunches, was rated by Detroit officials as a success. It

For Additional Information

Additional information concerning the 1970 amendments to the National School Lunch Act and the School Nutritional Act of 1966 and regulations governing the National School Lunch Program can be obtained by writing or calling the school food service officer in your state department of education or Herbert D. Rorex, Director, Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, 500 12th St., S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250. Phone: (202) 962-1627.

Educators may receive complimentary copies of the Act, PL 91-248, by writing their representative in Congress.

is now being expanded to 46 schools in disadvantaged areas of the city, Dept. of Agriculture officials said.

Opposition to the new regulations has been loudly voiced by state and local education officials. The American Assn. of School Administrators adopted this outspoken resolution at its February 1970 annual convention at Atlantic City: "In order to ensure that (food) programs contribute to the educational process by exemplifying good nutrition (school administrators should) refrain from entrusting their implementation to commercial firms rather than the school staff."

An example of state reaction to the new regulations is stated in an attack written by Earl M. Langkop, director of school food services, Missouri State Dept. of Education. "By a stroke of the pen," Langkop said, "nutrition service officials in Washington recently revised the National School Lunch Program regulations of long standing to permit the entrance of profit-motivated, commercial food management corporations on tax-supported educational premises.... This action was taken under great pressure, apparently brought to bear by lobbyists for the National Restaurant Assn. as well as a number of other profit-motivated large commercial food management firms, and in complete disregard for the strong recommendations of state and local administrators or school food service programs."

Langkop predicted that commercial operations in schools would begin with a well balanced lunch, "but soon revert to a bank of vending machines for the offering of high-profit snack items, sweets, and carbonated beverages." This is the kind of development PL 91-248 seeks to avoid.

SPECIAL SCHOOL MILK PROGRAM

On June 30, 1970, President Nixon permitted an extension of the Special Milk Program to become law (PL 91-295) without his signature. The bill, which is administered by the Agriculture Dept.'s Food and Nutrition Service, authorizes an appropriation of $120 million in fiscal 1971 and subsequent years. It was not included in the President's fiscal 1971 budget, and Agriculture Secy. Clifford M. Hardin, in a letter to Senate Agriculture Committee chairman Allen J. Ellender (D-La.), stated flatly: "The Department does not favor enactment of this bill." The President and the Agriculture Secretary reasoned that the newly expanded school lunch program will serve milk as part of its complete meal service to disadvantaged children and that the special milk program was overlapping and unnecessary.

The Agriculture Dept. has operated this program since 1954. Its object, according to the Senate Agriculture Committee report, is to encourage increased milk consumption by children and to help maintain "a healthy fluid milk dairy economy by expanding the market for fluid milk." In fiscal 1969, nearly 100,000 schools, camps, and child-care institutions participated in the program, and about 36 million children drank milk daily under the National School Lunch, Special Milk, and School Breakfast Programs.

Who Is Eligible

In 1954, only nonprofit schools of high school grade and under were eligible, but since then the program has been expanded to include nonprofit child-care institutions such as nursery schools, summer camps, and settlement houses. Generally speaking, any institution which has been declared tax exempt by the Internal Revenue Service is eligible for the program. The program is administered in all public schools within a state by the state educational agency. In many states, this same agency also administers the program in nonprofit private schools and child-care institutions, although there are a few states where child-care institutions are administered by another agency. A number of states are prohibited by state law from administering the program in nonprofit private schools and institutions. In these states the Agriculture Dept.'s Food and Nutrition Service administers the program.

How the Program Operates

Consumption of milk is encouraged through a system of reimbursement payments to participating schools and child-care institutions. These payments make it possible for the school or child-care institutions to inaugu-

More Information Needed?

For more information on the current status of the School Milk Program, contact: Herbert Rorex, Director, Child Nutrition Division, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. 20250. Phone: (202) 962-1627.

rate a milk service, expand their current service by offering milk at reduced prices, or establish additional or expanded milk service.

Schools and child-care institutions which charge separately for milk served must make maximum use of the reimbursement payments to reduce the price of milk to the children. The authorized maximum rates of reimbursement are 4 cents per half pint for schools which also participate in the National School Lunch Program (with no reimbursement paid on the first half pint of milk served with the Type A lunch), and 3 cents per half pint in those remaining schools and child-care institutions where milk is sold as a separately priced item. Up to 1 cent of this reimbursement may be retained for the purpose of defraying all or part of the handling cost. Within these maximum rates, the amount of reimbursement paid will depend upon the cost of the milk, the proposed selling price to the child, and the margin allowed to defray the cost of distributing milk within the school or institution.

Needy schools located in economically depressed areas may be eligible to receive additional assistance under the Special Milk Program if they: (a) have no facilities for preparing and serving food to enrolled children, or (b) participate in the National School Lunch Program and receive reimbursement payments averaging more than 9 cents per Type A lunch. Children attending these schools who can afford to pay the nominal price charged for milk are expected to do so. However, those who are unable to pay even this reduced price may receive milk free of charge. In these instances, schools are reimbursed by the federal government at a rate equal to the cost of the milk.

In most child-care institutions and in some schools, children do not purchase milk separately but receive it along with food and other services for a tuition, boarding, camping, or other fee. Because they cannot encourage children to drink more milk by reducing the selling price, these institutions must submit a plan showing the specific methods and service practices by which they hope to encourage children to drink more milk. Approval to participate in the program is based, in part, on the adequacy of this plan. To partially cover the cost of any increase in consumption, reimbursement is paid at a rate of 2 cents for each half pint of milk served.

Where To Apply for the School Milk Program

Public schools and nonprofit private schools and institutions in states not listed below should make application directly to their state educational agency in their capital city. (The Maryland state agency is in Baltimore, not Annapolis.) The states listed below are those that have laws prohibiting administration of the program for nonprofit private schools and institutions and are administered directly by the Agriculture Dept.:

	PRIVATE SCHOOLS	CHILD-CARE INSTITUTIONS	
Northeast:			
	Delaware	Delaware	U.S. Department of Agriculture
	Maine	Maine	Food & Nutrition Service
	Maryland	New Hampshire	Regional Office
	New Jersey	New Jersey	26 Federal Plaza
	Pennsylvania	Vermont	New York, N.Y. 10007
	West Virginia	West Virginia	
Southeast:			
	Alabama	Alabama	U.S. Department of Agriculture
	Florida	Florida	Food & Nutrition Service
	South Carolina	Georgia	Regional Office
	Tennessee	South Carolina	1795 Peachtree Road, Northeast
	Virginia	Tennessee	Atlanta, Ga. 30309
		Virginia	
Midwest:			
	Iowa	Iowa	U.S. Department of Agriculture
	Michigan	Michigan	Food & Nutrition Service
	Minnesota	Missouri	Regional Office
	Nebraska	Nebraska	536 South Clark St.
	North Dakota	North Dakota	Chicago, Ill. 60605
	Ohio	Ohio	
	Wisconsin	Wisconsin	
Southwest:			
	Arkansas	Arkansas	U.S. Department of Agriculture
	Colorado	Texas	Food & Nutrition Service
	Texas		Regional Office
			500 South Ervay St.
			Dallas, Texas 75201
Western:			
	Hawaii	Hawaii	U.S. Department of Agriculture
	Idaho	Idaho	Food & Nutrition Service
	Montana	Montana	Regional Office
	Nevada	Nevada	Appraiser's Building
	Washington	Oregon	630 Sansome St.
		Utah	San Francisco, Calif. 94111
		Washington	

HIGHER EDUCATION

Congress is currently studying legislation that could change the present map of higher education. President Nixon, in his March 19, 1970, message on higher education, called for a "thoroughgoing overhaul" of federal aid to colleges and college students. The Higher Education Act, due to expire June 30, 1971, is up for major revision.

Hovering over the debate like a mushroom cloud is the issue of campus violence and disorder. There are those who want to crack down on student dissenters by cutting off all forms of federal aid. There are others, both in Congress and in the Administration, who view this as a role the federal government should not assume. Because of the explosive nature of this issue, many observers fear it could tie up action on important higher education legislation.

President Nixon's higher education proposals would shift the priority to the low-income student. He has recommended a revamped student aid program with emphasis on the needs of poor youths. Under this plan, students whose families have an annual income of $4,500 or less would be guaranteed a total of $1,300 each in grants and subsidized loans. However, many members of Congress who might be expected to respond favorably to this idea are feeling pressure from their middle-income constituents. They claim the legislation neglects their struggle to meet escalating college costs in an inflationary economy.

Another feature of the President's proposal would create a National Student Loan Assn. which would raise money by selling government-guaranteed loans at competitive interest rates in the open market. It would be to student loans what the Federal National Mortgage Assn. (Fannie Mae) is to housing. This approach could solve many of the problems inherent in the present guaranteed student loan program.

The only higher education legislation actually enacted into law in 1969-70 were two revisions of present programs--"incentive payments" to banks and other lending agencies participating in the guaranteed student loan program and a 34.6% increase in payments to veterans under the GI Bill.

Guaranteed Student Loan Program

The Emergency Insured Student Loan Act of 1969 (PL 91-95) signed by President Nixon, Oct. 22, 1969, authorizes special allowances to banks and other lending agencies to make student loans more attractive.

In 1969, because of inflation, many college students had trouble finding banks and other lenders willing to make loans at the 7% interest rate set for the federally guaranteed student loan program. William Simmons, chief of the Insured Loan Branch in USOE's Bureau of Higher Education, explained the problem in testimony before the education subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee: "When this program was authorized in 1965 (under the Higher Education Act), there was a prime rate of 4.5%." He noted that Congress later increased the rate, but despite this, it was still below the prime rate. He said student loans had been priced out of the market. "Whether it be mortgage or personal loans or automobiles, we are low man on the totem pole."

Since the program became operative in 1966, a total of 18,774 lending institutions have backed $2.2 billion in guaranteed loans for 2,495,439 students. Under the guaranteed loan program, any student may borrow a maximum of $1,500 per academic year. Students from families with an adjusted family income of $15,000 or more are required to make interest payments while they are in school. For students from families with incomes below $15,000, the federal government pays the interest while they are in school, but they must take over the interest payments along with the principal after graduation.

Repayment may be deferred up to three years if a student is serving in the Armed Forces or becomes a full-time volunteer in the Peace Corps or VISTA. Repayments usually are due to begin from 9 to 12 months after the student completes or ceases his studies. They are normally paid in installments stretched over a period of from 5 to 10 years.

The loans may be made by banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions, pension funds, insurance companies, or educational institutions. The federal government guarantees payment to the lender even if the student defaults. The Higher Education Act Amendments of 1968 (PL 90-575) extended the program through fiscal 1971 and raised the maximum interest rate for the guaranteed loans to 7%.

However, this was still not enough to make them attractive in a market where banks could get a rate of up to 10%. Willis W. Alexander, president of the American Bankers Assn. (ABA), stated during Senate hearings on the student loan bill that the market for these loans is "an ever-expanding one over the foreseeable future." He noted that even though the federal government guarantees student loans, they are expensive to originate and service. Normally, the ABA president explained, more than one interview is involved and the paper work is "considerable." He pointed out that the repayment rate is drawn out and frequently is extended by changes in educational plans and grace periods for government and military service. The return to the lender should be "realistic" enough to allow him to break even, Alexander advised. He added: "In the present environment, the 7% rate now charged on such loans does not meet this goal."

The Emergency Student Loan Act is designed to meet these objections and make student loans competitive with others in the private market. It permits the HEW Secretary to pay banks and other lenders a bonus or special allowance of up to 3% over the 7% ceiling on the loans. The subsidy would be paid directly to lenders during periods of high interest rates.

The following are highlights of the Emergency Student Loan Act:

- It requires the HEW Secretary to consult with the Treasury Secretary and other heads of affected agencies before setting each new incentive payment. A new rate must be set at the end of each quarter for payments during that quarter.

- Authorizes $20 million for fiscal 1970, $40 million for fiscal 1971, and as much as needed thereafter to meet the cost of the special allowances on loans made before the expiration date of the law.

- Increases authorization for the National Defense Student Loan program by $50 million to $325 million in fiscal 1970 and by $75 million to $375 million in fiscal 1971; for the College Work-Study program, by $25 million to $275 million in fiscal 1970 and by $35 million to $320 million in fiscal 1971; and for the Educational Opportunity Grant program, by $25 million to $125 million for fiscal 1970 and by $30 million to $170 million for fiscal 1971.

- Calls for the Secretary of HEW to conduct a study on bank practices which might be interfering with the guaranteed loan program.

Such a study was completed and submitted to the House and Senate Education Committees in March 1970. Among its findings: Preference in the determination of loan eligibility due to sex, color, creed, or national origin is "almost nonexistent." However, the most "significant restriction" on guaranteed student loans is the requirement of a "customer relationship" as a qualification for obtaining a loan. Generally speaking, this means that the student and/or his family must have a checking, savings, or trust account, or certificates of deposit in the lending institution. Credit unions by their very nature require the student or parent to be a member.

The study reveals that 63% of the lenders show preference to those students having a customer relationship while 55% require such a relationship. The survey also reports that of those students who were successful in obtaining loans, only 37.3% were from families who did not have an account relationship with the lender. The study also shows that first-time borrowers--often freshmen or vocational students--have taken second place. Where restrictions against first-year students do exist, according to the study, it appears to be the result of diminishing loan funds and the moral obligation lenders feel to assist those continuing students holding prior loans. The study concluded that there is a need to "reevaluate the underlying purpose of the program."

More Information Available

For more information on the guaranteed student loan program, write to: William M. Simmons Jr., Office of Education, Bureau of Higher Education, Division of Student Financial Aid, Washington, D.C. 20202. Phone: (202) 962-2677. Educators may receive complimentary copies of the Emergency Student Loan Act of 1969 (PL 91-95) by writing to their representative in Congress.

Veterans Education and Training Amendments Act of 1970

The latest version of the GI Bill increases education and training benefits to Vietnam era veterans by approximately 34.6%. Signed by President Nixon on March 26, 1970, the bill is designed to cover the rise in education costs caused by inflation and to provide special assistance for educationally disadvantaged veterans.

President Nixon said he was "shocked and surprised" when the Committee on the Vietnam Veteran reported to him in June 1969 that only a small number of veterans were taking advantage of the GI Bill. Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Texas), sponsor of the original bill to increase the benefits, explained that he introduced it because of concern over the lack of participation in the education and training programs under the current GI Bill, which covers all who served since Jan. 31, 1955.

Fifty percent of the eligible veterans used their benefits under the World War II GI Bill and 42% of the veterans of the Korean conflict participated in education programs under the Korean conflict GI Bill. However, only 1.3 million, out of the 7 million eligible Vietnam veterans, have used their benefits. One cause of the low participation, according to the Veterans Administration (VA), was the low allowance rates paid a veteran each month. The payments did not meet the spiraling cost of education. Testimony on the bill before veterans affairs subcommittees of the House and Senate revealed that the cost of tuition and fees in private colleges have increased by almost 107% since 1958, and that these costs in public colleges have gone up 67% during the same period. The evidence also revealed that monthly educational allowances paid veterans were inadequate to meet these costs. According to the testimony, the current GI Bill was not doing the job. The Korean conflict GI Bill paid approximately 98% of the average tuition, board, and room costs at public and nonpublic colleges, whereas the current GI Bill covered only 67% of these costs.

Among major provisions of the new veterans education amendments:

- It increases from $130 to $175 a month the rate for single GI Bill veterans studying in an institutional full-time program.

- A veteran with one dependent will receive $205 a month, two dependents $230, and $13 for each additional dependent. Rates are scaled downward for less than full-time students.

- Single GI Bill students going three-quarter time will receive $128 a month, $152 with one dependent, $177 with two dependents, and an additional $10 a month for each additional dependent.

- Half-time GI students will receive $81 if they have no dependents, $100 with one dependent, $114 with two dependents, and an extra $7 for each additional dependent.

- The rate for a single veteran under the vocational rehabilitation program was increased from $110 to $135 a month for full-time students. A veteran with one dependent will receive $181 a month; two dependents,

For More Information

For additional information on veterans benefits, contact your local office of the Veterans Administration. Educators may receive copies of the legislation, technically known as the Veterans Education and Training Amendments Act of 1970 (PL 91-219), by writing to their representative in Congress.

$210; and $6 more for each additional dependent. These rates are also scaled downward for less than full-time students.

- For wives, widows, and children receiving allowances under the dependents educational assistance program, the new monthly rates for full-time students are $175; three-quarter time students, $128; and half-time students, $81.

In addition to the increase in the benefit rates, Title II of the amendments provides assistance for educationally disadvantaged veterans. Originally introduced as a separate bill by Sen. Alan Cranston (D-Calif.), this section constitutes the first major program for academically deficient and culturally and educationally deprived veterans ever enacted in a GI Bill.

Among the highlights of this section:

- A veteran who has academic difficulties may spend up to $50 a month for up to nine months for tutoring service.

- A new Predischarge Education Program (PREP) allows a serviceman to prepare for his future by taking preparatory courses while still on active duty. Under this provision, the VA reimburses the cost of tuition, fees, books, and supplies for remedial or refresher courses taken before the veteran leaves the service.

- The VA's counseling service is expanded to include an "outreach" program to insure that all veterans, especially those who have been recently discharged or released and who do not have a high school diploma, are informed of their rights under the GI education program.

Appropriations Summary

U.S. Office of Education, Fiscal Years 1970 and 1971

	Fiscal 1970 Appropriation	President's Fiscal 1971 Request	Fiscal 1971 Appropriation	Fiscal 1971 Authorizations *
Impact aid	$ 520,581,000	$ 425,000,000	$ 551,068,000	$1,105,350,000
Elementary and secondary education	1,614,397,900	1,614,693,000	1,846,968,000	3,908,288,893
Education for the handicapped	85,000,000	95,000,000	105,000,000	371,500,000
Vocational and adult education	419,046,000	440,046,000	494,196,000	1,217,311,455
Higher education	850,913,000	857,525,000	967,880,000	3,525,720,000
Education professions development	95,512,500	105,300,000	105,000,000	450,000,000
Teacher Corps	21,737,000	30,800,000	30,800,000	100,000,000
Community education (libraries)	67,213,250	59,446,000	85,040,000	346,100,000
Research and training	80,325,000	118,329,000	90,077,000	-0-
Educational activities overseas	1,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000	-0-
Salaries and expenses	44,308,000	46,733,000	45,164,000	-0-
Student Loan Insurance Fund	10,826,000	18,000,000	18,000,000	-0-
Higher Education Facilities Loan Fund	2,918,000	2,952,000	2,952,000	800,000,000
Emergency school assistance	-0-	150,000,000	75,000,000	-0-
Total	$3,813,777,650	$3,966,824,000	$4,420,145,000	$11,824,270,348

*These amounts are for definite or specified authorizations only.

Appropriations for Selected Educational Activities

Agency and Item	Fiscal 1970 Appropriation	President's Fiscal 1971 Request	Fiscal 1971 Appropriation
School assistance in federally affected areas:			
1. Maintenance and operations (874)	$ 505,400,000	$ 425,000,000[1]	$ 536,068,000
2. Construction (815)	15,181,000	-0-	15,000,000
(Obligations)	(14,416,000)	(21,049,000)	(36,049,000)
Total	$ 520,581,000	$ 425,000,000	$ 551,068,000
Elementary and secondary education:			
1. Aid to school districts:			
(a) Educationally deprived children (ESEA I)	$1,339,050,900[2]	$1,339,050,000	$1,500,000,000[3]
(b) Supplementary services (ESEA III)	130,843,000	120,393,000	143,393,000
(c) Library resources (ESEA II)	42,500,000	80,000,000	80,000,000
(d) Equipment and minor remodeling (NDEA III)	37,179,000	-0-	50,000,000
Subtotal	1,549,572,900	1,539,443,000	1,773,393,000
2. Dropout prevention (ESEA VIII)	5,000,000	15,000,000	10,000,000
3. Bilingual education (ESEA VII)	21,250,000	21,250,000	25,000,000
4. Strengthening state departments of education (ESEA V)	29,750,000	29,750,000	29,750,000
5. School nutrition and health (ESEA, Section 808)	-0-	-0-	-0-
6. Planning and evaluation (ESEA 1967, Section 402)	8,825,000	9,250,000	8,825,000
Total	$1,614,397,900	$1,614,693,000	$1,846,968,000
Education for the handicapped:			
1. State grant programs (ESEA VI)	$ 29,190,000	$ 31,900,000	$ 34,000,000
2. Early childhood projects (PL 90-538)	3,000,000	4,000,000	7,000,000
3. Teacher education and recruitment:			
(a) Teacher education (PL 85-926)	30,000,000	31,600,000	32,600,000
(b) Recruitment and information (ESEA VI-D)	475,000	500,000	500,000

Agency and Item	Fiscal 1970 Appropriation	President's Fiscal 1971 Request	Fiscal 1971 Appropriation
4. Research and innovation:			
(a) Research and demonstration (PL 88-164, Sec. 302)	13,360,000	14,450,000	15,300,000
(b) Regional resource centers (ESEA VI-B)	1,800,000	3,550,000	3,550,000
(c) Deaf-blind centers (ESEA VI-C)	2,000,000	2,500,000	4,500,000
(d) Media services and captioned films (PL 85-905)	4,750,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
5. Specific learning disabilities (ESEA 1970, Title VI, Part G)	-0-	-0-	1,000,000
6. Planning and evaluation (ESEA, 1967, Sec. 402)	425,000	500,000	550,000
Total	$ 85,000,000	$ 95,000,000	$ 105,000,000
Vocational and adult education:			
1. Basic vocational educational grants:			
(a) Grants to States (VEA, Part B)	$ 300,336,000	$ 300,336,000	$ 350,336,000[4]
(b) Consumer and homemaking education (VEA, Part F)	15,000,000	15,000,000	21,250,000
(c) State advisory councils (VEA, Part B)	2,380,000	2,380,000	2,380,000
(d) National advisory council (VEA, Part B)	200,000	330,000	330,000
Subtotal	317,916,000	318,046,000	374,296,000
2. Residential vocational schools (VEA, Sec. 151)	-0-	-0-	-0-
3. Work-study (VEA, Part H)	4,250,000	-0-	5,500,000
4. Cooperative education (VEA, Part G)	14,000,000	24,000,000	18,500,000
5. Research and innovation (VEA, Part D)	14,980,000	25,000,000	20,000,000[5]
6. Adult basic education (Adult Education Act)	49,900,000	55,000,000	55,000,000
7. Planning and evaluation (ESEA, 1967, Sec. 402)	1,000,000	1,000,000	900,000
8. Students with special needs (VEA, Sec. 102 B)	17,000,000	17,000,000	20,000,000
Total	$ 419,046,000	$ 440,046,000	$ 494,196,000

[1] To implement proposed reform legislation, proposed for separate transmittal.
[2] Includes $1,010,814,300 appropriated in the 1969 bill.
[3] Includes $7,841,685 for Part B—Incentive Grants and $15,453,650 for Part C—Grants for High Concentrations of Poor.
[4] Provides 10 percent of total for vocational research under Part C of the basic law.
[5] Earmarks $4,000,000 for curriculum development and $16,000,000 for exemplary programs.

Federal Money for Education:

Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education, Fiscal Year 1971

Reproduced with permission from December 1970 issue of *American Education*, published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	AUTHORIZATION	PURPOSE	APPROPRIATION*	WHO MAY APPLY	WHERE TO APPLY
GROUP I: For construction					
1 Public schools	School Aid to Federally Impacted and Major Disaster Areas (P.L. 815)	Aid school districts in providing minimum school facilities in federally impacted and disaster areas	$13,900,000	Local school districts	OE's Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
2 Educational broadcasting facilities	Public Broadcasting Act—part IV-A	Aid in the acquisition and installation of equipment for educational radio and TV	11,000,000	Nonprofit agencies, public colleges, State television agencies, education agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
3 Community colleges, technical institutes	Higher Education Facilities Act—title I	Construct or improve academic facilities	43,000,000	Public community colleges and technical institutes	State commissions
4 Interest subsidization, undergraduate and graduate facilities	Higher Education Facilities Act—title III	Loan assistance to construct or improve higher education facilities	21,000,000	Public and private nonprofit institutions and building agencies	OE—HEW Regional Offices
5 Vocational facilities	Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965	Construct vocational education facilities in the Appalachian region	25,000,000	State education agencies in Appalachian region	OE's Division of Vocational and Technical Education
6 Vocational schools	Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended	Construct or improve area vocational education school facilities	(See II-6)	Public secondary and post-secondary schools providing education in five or more fields	State boards of vocational education (information from OE's Division of Voc.-Tech. Education)
7 Public libraries	Library Services and Construction Act—title II	Aid construction of public libraries	7,092,500	State library administrative agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
GROUP II: To institutions and agencies for programs, instruction, and administration					
1 School maintenance and operation	School Aid to Federally Impacted and Major Disaster Areas (P.L. 874)	Aid school districts on which Federal activities or major disasters have placed a financial burden	536,068,000	Local school districts	OE's Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
2 Strengthening instruction in critical subjects in public schools	National Defense Education Act—title III	Strengthen instruction in 10 critically important subjects	47,500,000	Local school districts	State education agencies
3 Strengthening instruction in nonpublic schools	National Defense Education Act—title III	Loans to private schools to improve instruction in critical subjects	500,000	Nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools	OE's Division of State Agency Cooperation
4 School library resources and instructional materials	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title II	Support provision of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials	80,000,000	Local education agencies	State education agencies
5 Supplementary centers	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title III	Support supplementary educational centers and services	143,393,000 [1]	Local education agencies	State education agency or OE's Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers
6 Vocational programs	Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended	Maintain, extend, and improve vocational education programs; develop programs in new occupations	455,157,455	Public schools	State boards of vocational education (information from OE's Division of Voc.-Tech. Education)

7	Occupational training and retraining	Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended	Provide training programs to equip persons for work in needed employment fields	121,650,000	Local school authorities (public, private nonprofit)	State vocational education agency (information from OE's Division of Manpower Development and Training)
8	Desegregation assistance	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Aid school boards in hiring advisors, training employees, and providing technical assistance on school desegregation	8,700,000	School boards and other agencies responsible for public school operation	OE's Division of Equal Educational Opportunities
9	Teacher institutes (desegregation)	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Improve ability of school personnel to deal with school desegregation problems	7,300,000 [2]	Colleges and universities	OE's Division of Equal Educational Opportunities
10	Teacher development for desegregating schools	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Retrain experienced teachers for service in desegregating schools	4,900,000	Colleges and universities	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
11	Desegregation assistance	Office of Education Appropriation Act of 1971 (P.L. 91–380)	Aid local educational agencies in special programs designed to assist the school systems in the implementation of desegregation	64,260,000	Local educational agencies that have submitted a final State or Federal Court order or a voluntary desegregation plan	OE's Regional Offices, Office of Equal Educational Opportunities
12	Desegregation assistance	Office of Education Appropriation Act of 1971 (P.L. 91–380)	Assist in the implementation of one or more desegregation plans	7,140,000	Public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution (other than a local educational agency)	U.S. Office of Education
13	Group projects abroad for language training and area studies in non-Western areas	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, and P.L. 83–480 (in excess foreign currency countries)	Promote development of international studies	3,000,000 [3]	Colleges, universities, consortiums, local and State education agencies, nonprofit education organizations	OE's Institute of International Studies
14	Institutional cooperative research abroad for comparative and cross cultural studies	P.L. 83–480	Promote research on educational problems of mutual concern to American and foreign educators	(See II–13) [3]	Colleges, universities, State departments of education	OE's Institute of International Studies
15	Modern foreign language graduate fellowships	National Defense Education Act—title VI	Enable U.S. institutions to assist graduate students training to be teachers or other specialists in foreign language and area studies	3,270,000 [2]	Colleges and universities with language-area studies programs or summer programs of intensive study	OE's Institute of International Studies
16	Consultant services of foreign curriculum specialists	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act	Support visits by foreign consultants to improve and develop resources for foreign language and area studies	100,000	Colleges, consortiums, local and State education agencies, nonprofit education organizations	OE's Institute of International Studies
17	Language and area centers	National Defense Education Act—title VI	Support foreign language and area centers at U.S. institutions of higher education	3,400,000	Colleges and universities	OE's Institute of International Studies
18	Bilingual educational personnel	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train educational personnel for schools using two languages for instruction	1,000,000	State and local education agencies, colleges, and universities	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
19	Attracting qualified educational personnel	Education Professions Development Act—part A	Attract capable youth to careers in education	500,000	State and local education agencies, colleges, and universities	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
20	Educational career opportunities	Education Professions Development Act—part D	Train persons from low-income backgrounds to career ladder—work-study positions in poverty area schools	25,800,000	Local school districts with concentration of pupils from low-income backgrounds	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
21	Vocational-technical education personnel	Education Professions Development Act—part F	Develop leadership in vocational education and improve training opportunities for vocational education personnel	6,900,000	Institutions of higher education, State boards of vocational education	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development

TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	AUTHORIZATION	PURPOSE	APPROPRIATION*	WHO MAY APPLY	WHERE TO APPLY
22 Meeting critical shortages of classroom personnel	Education Professions Development Act—part B–2	Attract and train persons otherwise engaged to meet immediate critical shortages of teachers and teacher aides	15,000,000	State education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (local districts apply to State education agencies)
23 Training teacher trainers	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Improve quality of teacher education and merge preservice and inservice training	9,900,000	Teacher training institutions, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
24 Teacher training complex	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Develop new agency for teacher training in metropolitan areas	2,300,000	Teacher training institutions, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
25 Personnel services staff development	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Improve preservice and inservice training for pupil personnel specialists, increase supply of such specialists	4,900,000	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
26 Media specialists	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train specialized personnel for State or local instructional media support	1,800,000	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
27 Special education personnel	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train educational personnel to meet needs of handicapped children in regular classrooms	6,900,000	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
28 Educational administration	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train prospective and experienced school administrators	3,900,000	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
29 Urban/rural school staff development	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Improve pupil achievement in proverty area schools	9,300,000	Local school districts with concentrations of pupils from low-income backgrounds	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
30 Early childhood education personnel	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train and retrain educational personnel who work with children ages 3–9	5,900,000	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
31 Drug education training	Education Professions Development Act—part D	Train educational personnel in drug abuse education	600,000	State education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
32 Teacher Corps	Education Professions Development Act—part B–1	Introduce change in the ways in which teachers are trained and utilized	30,800,000	State and local education agencies, colleges, and universities	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Teacher Corps
33 Institutes, short-term training programs, and special projects	Education Professions Development Act—part E	Train teachers, administrators, and specialists serving or preparing to serve in higher education	5,000,000	Colleges and universities	OE's Division of College Support
34 National teaching fellowships and professors emeritus [2]	Higher Education Act of 1965—title III	Strengthen the teaching resources of developing institutions	(See II–78) [2]	Developing institutions nominating prospective fellows from established institutions and retired scholars	OE's Division of College Support
35 Research training	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Develop and strengthen programs for training educational researchers	(See III–22) [2]	State education agencies, institutions, and organizations	OE's Division of Higher Education Research, Research Training Branch
36 Information and recruitment grants	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Improve recruiting of personnel and dissemination of information on educational opportunities for handicapped	500,000 [2]	Public or nonprofit agencies, organizations, private agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
37 School personnel utilization	Education Professions Development Act—part D	Develop more effective means of utilizing school staff, time, instructional materials	3,000,000	State and local education agencies	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development
38 Training for library service	Higher Education Act of 1965—title II–B	Increase opportunities for training in librarianship	3,900,000	Colleges and universities	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology

39	Public library services	Library Services and Construction Act—title I	Extend and improve public library services	35,000,000	State library administrative agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
40	Interlibrary cooperation	Library Services and Construction Act—title III	Establishment and operation of cooperative networks of libraries	2,281,000	State library administrative agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
41	State institutional library services	Library Services and Construction Act—title IV–A	Establish and improve institutional library services	2,094,000	State library administrative agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
42	Library services to physically handicapped	Library Services and Construction Act—title IV–B	Establish and improve library services to physically handicapped	1,334,000	State library administrative agencies	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
43	College library resources	Higher Education Act of 1965—title II–A	Strengthen library resources of junior colleges, colleges, universities, and post-secondary vocational schools	15,325,000	Institutions of higher education and combinations thereof and branches of institutions of higher education	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
44	Student loans—matching funds	National Defense Education Act—title II	Loans to post-secondary institutions unable to meet program's matching obligations	2,000,000	Accredited educational institutions (including business schools and technical institutes)	OE's Division of Student Financial Aid
45	Cuban student loans	Migration and Refugee Assistance Act	Provide a loan fund to aid Cuban refugee students	4,800,000	Colleges and universities	OE's Division of Student Financial Aid
46	College work-study	Higher Education Act of 1965—title IV-C	Provide part-time employment for post-secondary students	158,400,000	Colleges,universities, vocational and proprietary schools	OE's Division of Student Financial Aid
47	Higher education guarantee reserve funds	Higher Education Act of 1965—part IV-B	Provide adequate loan reserves for higher and vocational education student loans	2,000,000	State or nonprofit private guarantee agencies	OE's Division of Student Financial Aid
48	Educational opportunity grants	Higher Education Act of 1965—title IV-A	Assist students of exceptional financial need to go to college	167,700,000	Institutions of higher education	OE's Division of Student Financial Aid
49	Talent Search	Higher Education Act of 1965—title IV-A, as amended by the Higher Education Amendments of 1968—title I-A	Assist in identifying and encouraging promising students to complete high school and pursue post-secondary education	5,000,000	Institutions of higher education and combinations of such institutions, public and private nonprofit agencies, and public and private organizations	OE's Division of Student Special Services
50	Upward Bound	Higher Education Amendments of 1968—title I-A	Precollege program for young people from low-income backgrounds and inadequate high school preparation	28,500,000	Institutions of higher education and secondary or post-secondary schools capable of providing residential facilities	OE's Division of Student Special Services
51	Student special services	Higher Education Amendments of 1968—title I-A	Assist low-income and handicapped students to complete post-secondary education	15,000,000	Accredited institutions of higher education or consortiums	OE's Division of Student Special Services
52	Follow Through	Economic Opportunity Act of 1964	Extend gains into primary grades of deprived children in Head Start or similar preschool programs	69,400,000	Local education or other agencies nominated by State education agency in accordance with OE and OEO criteria	Application by invitation only
53	Programs for disadvantaged children, including neglected and delinquent children in local institutions	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 89–750)	To meet educational needs of deprived children	1,334,068,589	Local school districts	State education agencies
54	Programs for migratory children	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 89–750)	To meet educational needs of children of migratory farm workers	56,115,390	Local school districts	State education agencies
55	Programs for children in State institutions for the neglected and delinquent	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 89–750)	Improve the education of delinquent and neglected children in State institutions	17,555,746	State parent agencies	State education agencies

45

TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	AUTHORIZATION	PURPOSE	APPROPRIATION*	WHO MAY APPLY	WHERE TO APPLY
56 Programs for Indian children	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 89–750)	To provide additional educational assistance to Indian children in federally operated schools	11,400,000	Bureau of Indian Affairs schools	Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of Interior
57 Bilingual education	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title VII	Develop and operate programs for children aged 3–18 who have limited English-speaking ability	25,000,000	Local education agencies or institutions of higher education applying jointly with local education agencies	State education agencies and OE's Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers
58 Dropout prevention	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title VIII	Develop and demonstrate educational practices to reduce the number of children not completing school	10,000,000	Local school districts in low-inome areas and with high percentages of dropouts	State education agencies and OE's Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers
59 Programs for the handicapped	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Strengthen educational and related services for handicapped children	34,000,000	State education agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
60 Media services and captioned film loan program	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Provide cultural and educational services to the handicapped through films and other media	6,000,000	Groups of handicapped persons, nonhandicapped groups for training purposes	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
61 Deaf-blind centers	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	To develop centers for children and parents	4,500,000	State education agencies, universities, medical centers, public or nonprofit agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
62 Programs for the handicapped in State supported schools	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (P.L. 89–313, amended)	Programs for children in State operated or supported schools for the handicapped	41,222,837 [1]	State education agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
63 Preschool programs for handicapped children	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Develop model preschool and early education programs for handicapped children	7,000,000	Public agencies and private nonprofit agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
64 Regional resource centers to improve education of handicapped children	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Develop centers for educational remediation of handicapped children	3,550,000	Institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies, or combinations within particular regions	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Research
65 Civil defense education	Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950	Provide public information on civil defense procedures	2,000,000 [5]	Chief State school officers or State agencies	OE's Division of Adult Education Programs
66 Adult basic education	Adult Education Act of 1966	Provide literacy programs for adults	55,000,000	State education agencies	OE's Division of Adult Education Programs
67 State administration of ESEA title I programs	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 89–750)	To strengthen administration of ESEA title I	16,648,648	State education agencies	OE's Division of Compensatory Education
68 Strengthening State education agencies	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title V	Improve leadership resources of State education agencies	29,750,000	State education agencies and combinations thereof	OE's Division of State Agency Cooperation
69 Planning and evaluation	Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1967—title IV	Improve State planning and evaluation of Federal programs	5,000,000	State education agencies	OE's Division of State Agency Cooperation
70 State administration	National Defense Education Act—title III	Strengthen administration in State education agencies	2,000,000	State education agencies	OE's Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers
71 Incentive grants	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 91–230)	Encourage greater State and local expenditures for education	7,535,040	State education agencies who exceed the national effort index	OE's Division of Compensatory Education
72 Special grants to urban and rural school districts with high concentrations of poor children	Elementary and Secondary Ed. Act—title I (amended by P.L. 91–230)	Improve education of disadvantaged children	15,453,750	Local school districts	State education agencies

73	Cooperative education programs	Labor-HEW Appropriation Act of 1970	Support for planning and implementation of cooperative education programs	1,600,000	Colleges and universities	OE's Division of College Support
74	State administration of HEFA program	Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963	Help States administer programs under HEFA—title I	3,000,000	State commissions that administer program	OE's Division of Academic Facilities
75	Facilities comprehensive planning	Higher Education Facilities Act—title I	Help States plan higher education construction programs	3,000,000	State commissions that administer program	OE's Division of Academic Facilities
76	To endow agriculture and mechanic arts colleges	Bankhead-Jones and Morrill-Nelson Acts	Support instruction in agriculture and mechanic arts in the land-grant colleges	12,680,000	The 69 land-grant colleges	OE's Division of College Support
77	Strengthening community service programs	Higher Education Act of 1965—title I	Strengthen higher education capabilities in helping communities solve their problems	9,500,000	Colleges and universities	State agencies or institutions designated to administer State plans (information from OE's Division of University Programs)
78	Strengthening developing institutions	Higher Education Act of 1965—title III	Provide partial support for cooperative arrangements between developing and established institutions	33,850,000	Accredited colleges and universities in existence at least five years	OE's Division of College Support
79	Cuban refugee education	Migration and Refugee Assistance Act	Help school systems meet the financial impact of Cuban refugee education	17,000,000	School districts with significant numbers of Cuban refugee school age children	OE's Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas
GROUP III: To individuals for teacher and other professional training and for student assistance						
1	Occupational training and retraining	Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended	Train unemployed and underemployed persons in all sections of the Nation	(See II-7)	Persons referred by State employment services	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Manpower Development Training)
2	Educational career opportunities	Education Professions Development Act—part D	Train persons from low-income backgrounds to career ladder—work-study positions in poverty area schools	25,800,000	Prospective teachers and teacher aides from low-income backgrounds	Participating local school districts[6]
3	Vocational-technical education personnel	Education Professions Development Act—part F	Develop leadership in vocational education and improve training opportunities for vocational education personnel	6,900,000	Prospective and experienced vocational-technical education personnel	Participating institutions of higher education or State boards of vocational education[6]
4	Meeting critical shortages of classroom personnel	Education Professions Development Act—part B-2	Attract and train persons otherwise engaged to meet immediate critical shortages of teachers and teacher aides	15,000,000	Prospective teachers and teacher aides currently not engaged in education	State education agencies or participating local school districts[6]
5	Training teacher trainers	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Improve quality of teacher education and merge preservice and inservice training	9,900,000	Teacher trainers and teachers associated with participating institutions of higher education or local school districts	Participating institutions and local school districts[6]
6	Teacher training complex	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Develop new agency for teacher training in metropolitan areas	2,300,000	Teacher trainers and teachers associated with participating institutions of higher education or local school districts	Participating institutions and local school districts [6]
7	Personnel services staff development	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Improve preservice and inservice training for pupil personnel specialists, increase supply of such specialists	4,900,000	Prospective and/or experienced personnel services staff specialists	Participating institutions or agencies[6]
8	Media specialists	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train specialized personnel for State or local instructional media support	1,800,000	Prospective and/or experienced school media specialists, administrators, and teacher trainers	Participating institutions or agencies (information from OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology)
9	Special education	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train educational personnel to meet needs of handicapped children in regular classrooms	6,900,000	Educational personnel involved in education of handicapped children in regular classrooms	Participating institutions or agencies [6]
10	Educational administration	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train prospective and experienced school administrators	3,900,000	Prospective and experienced school administrators	Participating institutions or agencies [6]

TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	AUTHORIZATION	PURPOSE	APPROPRIATION*	WHO MAY APPLY	WHERE TO APPLY
11 Urban/rural school development	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Retrain staff in urban and rural poverty area schools	2,300,000	Experienced teachers in urban and rural poverty area school districts	Participating local school districts [6]
12 Early childhood education personnel	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train and retrain educational personnel who work with children ages 3–9	5,900,000	Teachers, teacher trainers, supervisors, and specialists in early childhood education	Participating institutions or agencies [6]
13 Drug abuse education training	Education Professions Development Act—part D	Train educational personnel in drug abuse education	6,000,000	Educational personnel	State education agencies [6]
14 Teacher Corps	Education Professions Development Act—part B–1	Train experienced teachers as team leaders, college and university undergraduates and graduates as interns for service in poverty area schools	30,800,000	Experienced teachers as team leaders, college and university undergraduates and graduates as interns	OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Teacher Corps (information from participating school systems and institutions)
15 Bilingual educational personnel	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Train educational personnel for schools using two languages for instruction	1,000,000	Staff in participating school districts	Participating school districts [6]
16 School personnel utilization	Education Professions Development Act—part D	Develop more effective means of utilizing school staff, time, instructional materials	3,000,000	Educational personnel in participating local school districts	Participating local school districts [6]
17 Desegregation training grants	Civil Rights Act of 1964	Improve ability of school personnel to deal with desegregation problems	(See II–8) [2]	Teachers and other personnel of public schools	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Equal Educational Opportunities)
18 Teacher development for desegregating schools	Education Professions Development Act—parts C and D	Retrain experienced teachers for service in desegregating schools	4,900,000	Experienced teachers in desegregating schools	Participating institutions [6]
19 Personnel training to educate handicapped children	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Prepare and inform teachers and others who educate handicapped children	31,900,000	State education agencies, colleges, universities, and other appropriate nonprofit agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Training Programs
20 Physical education and recreation for the handicapped	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Training physical education and recreation personnel for the handicapped	700,000 [2]	Public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Training Programs
21 Special programs for children with specific learning disabilities	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Prepare and inform teachers and others who educate children with specific learning disabilities	1,000,000	State education agencies, colleges, universities, and other appropriate nonprofit agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Training Programs
22 Research training grants	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Improve training for educational researchers	2,000,000	Institutions training researchers in education	Information from OE's Division of Higher Education Research
23 Fellowships for higher education personnel	Education Professions Development Act—part E	Training persons to serve as teachers, administrators, or educational specialists in higher education	5,000,000	Institutions of higher education with graduate programs	OE's Division of University Programs
24 Adult basic education teacher training grants	Adult Education Act of 1966	Improve qualifications of teachers of adult basic education courses	(See II–66) [2]	Teachers and teacher trainers of adult basic education courses	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Adult Education Programs)
25 Development of educators from abroad	Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act	Provide opportunity for educators to observe U.S. methods, curriculum, organization (elementary, secondary, higher)	575,000 [3]	Educators from abroad (administrators, teacher trainers, education ministry officials)	U.S. embassies, educational commissions, foundations abroad (information from OE's Institute of International Studies)

26	Teacher exchange	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act	Promote international understanding and professional competence by exchange of teachers between U.S. and foreign nations	18,775	Elementary and secondary teachers, college instructors, and assistant professors	OE's Institute of International Studies
27	Technical assistance training grants	Act for International Development of 1961	Provide specialist training to foreign educators and strengthen education and economy in developing nations	3,600,000 [2]	Foreign nationals from countries with which U.S. has bilateral technical assistance agreements	AID Mission with the concurrence of the local education ministry (Information from OE's Institute of International Studies)
28	Modern foreign language graduate fellowships	National Defense Education Act—title VI	Enable U.S. institutions to assist graduate students training to be teachers or other specialists in foreign language and area studies	3,270,000 [2]	Graduate students in approved language and area studies programs	Participating institutions (information from OE's Institute of International Studies)
29	Fellowship opportunities abroad	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, and P.L. 83–480 (in excess foreign currency countries)	Promot instruction in international studies through grants for graduate and faculty projects	(See II–13) [3]	Faculty, graduate students, advanced upperclassmen in foreign languages and area studies	Institutions of higher education at which applicants are enrolled or employed (information from OE's Institute of International Studies)
30	Cuban student loans	Migration and Refugee Assistance Act	Aid needy Cuban refugee college students to finance their education	(See II–45)	Cubans who became refugees after January 1, 1959	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Student Financial Aid)
31	Student loans	National Defense Education Act—title II	Provide for low-interest loans to college students	236,500,000	College students	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Student Financial Aid)
32	Educational opportunity grants	Higher Education Act of 1965—title IV–A	Assist students of exceptional financial need to go to college	(See II–48)	College students of exceptional financial need	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Student Financial Aid)
33	Graduate fellowships	National Defense Education Act—title IV	Increase the number of well-qualified college teachers	47,350,000 [2]	Prospective college teachers working toward doctoral degrees	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of University Programs)
34	College work-study	Higher Education Act of 1965—title IV–C	Provide part-time employment for post-secondary students	(See II–46)	Post-secondary students	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of Student Financial Aid)
35	National teaching fellowships and professors emeritus	Higher Education Act of 1965—title III	Strengthen the teaching resources of developing institutions	(See II–34) [4]	Highly qualified graduate students or junior faculty members from established institutions and retired scholars	Participating institutions (information from OE's Division of College Support)
36	Training for library service	Higher Education Act of 1965—title II–B	Increase opportunities throughout the Nation for training in librarianship	(See II–38) [2]	Prospective and/or experienced librarians and information specialists	Participating institutions (information from OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology)
37	Media services and captioned films training grants	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Improve quality of instruction available to deaf persons	(See II–60) [2]	Persons who will use captioned film equipment	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Educational Services
38	Interest benefits for higher education loans	Higher Education Act of 1965—title IV–B	Provide interest benefits for student loans through commercial lenders	119,759,000	Students in eligible institutions of higher and vocational education	Participating lenders (information from OE's Division of Student Financial Aid)
39	Fellowships abroad for doctoral dissertation research in foreign language and area studies	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act	Promote instruction in international studies through grants for graduate and faculty projects	721,000	Prospective teachers of language and area studies	Participating institutions (information from OE's Institute of International Studies)

GROUP IV: For research

1	Educational research (research, studies, demonstrations)	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Support research on the improvement of education at all levels and in all subjects	15,000,000	Colleges, universities, State education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals	Research Analysis and Allocations Staff, National Center for Educational Research and Development

TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	AUTHORIZATION	PURPOSE	APPROPRIATION*	WHO MAY APPLY	WHERE TO APPLY
2 Dissemination	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV) and Sec. 303 Voc. Education Act	Provide for dissemination of educational information and improved practices to the educational community	5,000,000	(Same as IV–1)	OE's National Center for Educational Communication
3 Experimental schools	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Study feasibility of major educational reforms in total settings	15,000,000	(Same as IV–1)	National Center for Educational Research and Development
4 Nutrition and health	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Pilot studies coordinating health services and education	2,000,000	(Same as IV–1)	Research Analysis and Allocations Staff, National Center for Educational Research and Development
5 Major demonstrations	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Demonstrate combinations of innovative programs	2,250,000	(Same as IV–1)	National Center for Educational Research and Development
6 Foreign language and area research	National Defense Education Act—title VI	Support research on improved instruction in modern foreign languages and materials development and area studies	500,000	Colleges and universities, public school systems, professional organizations, individuals	OE's Institute of International Studies
7 Library research and demonstration	Higher Education Act of 1965—title II–B	Library and information science research and development	2,171,000 [2]	Colleges, universities, school districts, State governments, other nonprofit groups	OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology
8 Special centers for research and development	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Conduct research on the major problems of education	9,300,000	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations	OE's Division of Educational Laboratories
9 Educational laboratories	Cooperative Research Act (amended by ESEA—title IV)	Development and testing of educational innovations until ready for classroom use	25,106,000	Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations	OE's Division of Educational Laboratories
10 Vocational education research	Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended	Support vocational education research	(See II–6)	State and local education agencies, colleges, and universities, nonprofit organizations	OE's Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research
11 Handicapped research and demonstration	Mental Retardation Facilities Act and Others (P.L. 85–296, as amended)	Promote research and demonstration on education of the handicapped	15,000,000	State education agencies, local school districts, nonprofit private organizations, public groups	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Research
12 Special programs for children with specific learning disabilities	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	Develop model centers for the improvement of education of children with specific learning disabilities	(See III–21)	State education agencies, colleges, universities, and other appropriate nonprofit agencies	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Research
13 Overseas research in language and area studies in non-Western areas	Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act, and P.L. 83–480 (in excess foreign currency countries)	Promote development of international studies through grants to institutions for support of group or individual (faculty and Ph.D. dissertation) research	(See III–29)	Colleges, universities, consortiums, local and State education agencies, nonprofit educational organizations	Participating institutions (information from OE's Institute of International Studies)
14 Physical education and recreation for the handicapped	Education of the Handicapped Act—title VI (P.L. 91–230)	To do research in areas of physical education and recreation for handicapped children	300,000	State or local education agencies, public or nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations	OE's Bur. of Ed'n. for Handicapped, Division of Research

1 At least 15 percent for handicapped.
2 Programs which include educational personnel training.
3 Taken from a total $3,000,000 in appropriated excess foreign currencies.
4 Appropriated in previous years.
5 For State contracts only.
6 Information from OE's Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

Other Reports by the Editors of Education U.S.A.

AASA Convention Reporter. Highlights of the 1970 Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 14-18. #411-12750. 24 pp. $1.50.

The Big Talent Hunt. How leading districts recruit teachers, as told by recruiters and placement officers. #411-12446. 1969. 32 pp. $5.

Black Studies in Schools. A roundup of successful programs and policies across the nation—what school systems are doing about black and other ethnic studies programs. #411-12746. 1970. 48 pp. $4.

Differentiated Staffing: A Review of Current Policies and Programs. Tells how some schools are using this new way of deploying and paying teachers and whether it works. #411-12754. 1970. 48 pp. $4.

High School Student Unrest. Tells school administrators how to anticipate protest, channel activism, and protect student rights. Tells where and why high school students are protesting. #411-12744. 1969. 48 pp. $4.

Individually Prescribed Instruction. Answers such questions as: What is IPI? How is it working in experimental elementary schools? How does it differ from the traditional school? What changes are necessary to introduce IPI into a traditional school? #411-12420. 1968. 32 pp. $3.

NAESP Convention Reporter. Highlights of the 1970 Annual Meeting of the National Association of Elementary School Principals, Philadelphia, Pa., April 18-22. #411-12752. 24 pp. $2.

NASSP Convention Reporter. Highlights of the 54th Annual Meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Washington, D.C., February 7-11, 1970. #411-12748. 24 pp. $2.

Preschool Breakthrough: What Works in Early Childhood Education. Comprehensive report on what's happening in early childhood education, including descriptions of federal programs, working projects, research, and trends. #411-12774. 48 pp. $4.

Reading Crisis: The Problem and Suggested Solutions. A roundup of the most significant recent discoveries on reading problems and a guide to supervisory and teaching techniques that work. #411-12766. 56 pp. $4.

Religion and the Schools: From Prayer to Public Aid. Report on problems and solutions to current school/religion conflicts: public aid to nonpublic schools, prayer in the classroom, teaching about religion, cooperation between public and nonpublic schools. #411-12772. 56 pp. $4.

Sex Education in Schools. A review of current policies and programs for the guidance of school personnel and parents. #411-12732. 1969. 48 pp. $3.

The Shape of Education for 1970-71. Twelve articles in concise understandable language highlight significant new developments that have surfaced as major educational issues. A handy reliable sourcebook for speech and news writers on what's new in education. #411-12760. 1970. 64 pp. $3.

Urban School Crisis: The Problem and Solutions Proposed by the Urban Education Task Force of HEW. A blueprint of the extraordinary deficiencies in our urban school system, with a clear guide for correcting them. Reproduced from the *Congressional Record.* #411-12756. 1970. 64 pp. $4.

Address communication and make checks payable to National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036